

# SHOULD UNCLE SAM BUILD MORE CRUISERS?



**JANUARY 1929**

**Should Uncle Sam Build More Cruisers?**

**Naval Developments Since 1921  
by the Secretary of the Navy**

**Cruisers and Their Varied Uses  
by Admiral Charles P. Hughes, U. S. N.**

**Pro and Con Discussion by  
Senator Frederick Hale  
Senator William H. King  
Senator Frederick H. Gillett  
Rt. Hon. W. C. Bridgeman, M. P.  
Frederick J. Libby  
and others**

---

**Regular Departments**

---

**FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR**



**FIFTY CENTS A COPY**

# The Congressional Digest

Not an Official Organ, Not Controlled by Nor Under the Influence of Any Party, Interest, Class or Sect

ALICE GRAM ROBINSON, NORBORNE T. N. ROBINSON, *Editors and Publishers*  
Editorial Offices, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

Published Every Month, except for July and August. Current Subscription Rates: \$5.00 a Year, Postpaid in U. S.; in Canada \$5.25; Foreign Rates \$5.50; Current Numbers 50c a copy; Back Numbers 75c a copy; Volumes III, IV and V, Bound, \$7.50 each; Unbound, \$6.00. Address all Orders and Correspondence to:

THE CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

Copyright, 1929, by Alice Gram Robinson, Washington, D. C.

Entered as Second-Class Matter September 26th, 1921, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., Under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry as Second-Class Matter at the Post Office at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879; authorized August 22, 1927

## Contents for This Month

### **Legislative Department:**

<b>The Pro and Con Feature: Should Uncle Sam Build More Cruisers?</b>	
Naval Developments Since 1921	
Hon. Curtis D. Wilbur.....	1
The Modern Naval Cruiser and its Varied Uses	
Admiral Charles P. Hughes.....	4
Naval Strength of the United States, Great Britain and Japan.....	5
British and Japanese Viewpoints on the Navy Cruiser Problem.....	6
The Original Navy Program.....	7
Provisions of the Pending Cruiser Bill.....	7
President Coolidge on the Cruiser Bill.....	8
Mr. Hoover on National Defense.....	9
Should Uncle Sam Build More Cruisers?.....	10
Hon. Frederick Hale (Pro) v. Hon. William H. King (Con).....	10
Hon. Fred A. Britten (Pro) v. Hon. Ralph F. Lozier (Con).....	12
Charleston, W. Va., Mail (Pro) v. Wheeling, W. Va., Register (Con).....	13
Washington Post (Pro) v. Des Moines Register (Con).....	14
Montgomery, Ala., Advertiser (Pro) v. The New York World (Con).....	15
Does U. S. Navy Need Fifteen Cruisers?.....	16
Hon. Frederick H. Gillett (Pro) v. Frederick J. Libby (Con).....	16
Does Naval Preparedness Prevent War?.....	18
Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers (Pro) v. Hon. O. J. Kvale (Con).....	18
The January Outlook in Congress, by Norborne T. N. Robinson.....	20
Congress Passes the Boulder Dam Bill.....	22
The Moses Resolution.....	23
The McNary Farm Relief Bill, by Hon. Wm. M. Jardine.....	24
<b>This Month:</b>	
Action by Congress, December 3 to December 30.....	26

### **Executive Department:**

The White House Calendar, December 4 to December 30.....	30
--	----

### **Judicial Department:**

The Month in the Supreme Court, November 26 to December 10.....	31
---	----

Back numbers of the Congressional Digest are indexed in the Readers' Guide.

# The Congressional Digest

January, 1929

Vol. 8 - No. 1

## LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT

THE PRO AND CON FEATURE    ACTION BY HOUSE AND SENATE    LEGISLATIVE NEWS ITEMS

THE PRO AND CON FEATURE:

### The Navy Cruiser Bill

Naval Developments Since 1921  
President Coolidge's Recommendations  
Navy Cruisers and Their Uses

Mr. Hoover on National Defense  
Provisions of the Pending Cruiser Bill  
British and Japanese Views

Should Uncle Sam Build More Cruisers—Discussed Pro and Con

### Naval Developments Since 1921

By Hon. Curtis D. Wilbur,

Secretary of the Navy



T the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armament, of 1921, Great Britain had actual superiority in ships afloat and in commission. The United States had potential superiority, in that the completion of the battle cruisers and battleships then under construction would give us unquestioned superiority for a long time to come. During the World War the battleship and battle cruiser program, inaugurated in 1916, was suspended in order that the entire shipbuilding activities of the country should be devoted to the construction of destroyers and merchant ships, to meet the submarine menace. At the conclusion of the war it was obvious that if Great Britain desired to retain superiority or even attain parity, a great shipbuilding program would have to be inaugurated and continued by Great Britain. We

could have maintained superiority after we had attained it by matching Great Britain's new construction so that we would always have the superiority we had acquired by the partial completion of the great ships proposed in the 1916 program.

#### Why the Washington Conference Was Called

To avoid this competition, and the enormous expenditures involved in it, as well as to reassure the nations of the world of our peaceful intentions and to enable our own people as well as the people of the other naval powers to devote their money and their attention to civil rather than military affairs, the Washington Conference was called. As a result of that conference we yielded the unquestioned potential

superiority which we then held, we ceased construction upon the ships then building; we paid the contractors the losses they suffered by reason of the cessation of the shipbuilding program; and we scrapped these beautiful new ships. That is to say, we took them to pieces and sold the pieces as scrap iron. Steam boilers which cost us from twenty to thirty thousand dollars to fabricate were cut up with the electric torch and sold as scrap for nine dollars a ton.

#### *Sinking the Battleship Washington*

The battleship WASHINGTON, on which twenty-two million dollars had been spent, was taken out and sunk. The 132 16-inch guns intended for mounting upon the battleships and battle cruisers then under construction have not been used. The LEXINGTON and SARATOGA, battle cruisers, partly constructed, were converted to aircraft carriers. The 16-inch guns that they were to carry were discarded and replaced by 8-inch guns in accordance with the terms of the treaty. It is less than five years since we completed the scrapping of these ships. And yet, we find ourselves assailed from every side by pacific declarations that we are becoming militaristic. We are advised that to put these new ships in possession of Uncle Sam would undoubtedly convert him into a militaristic terror to the world. It is un-Christian, it is said, to build these ships. . . . that we ought to know warships cause war. It would seem that in view of the recent World War, and in view of the enormous sacrifices cheerfully made by this government and by the navy in the interest of peace and harmony and disarmament, these outpourings might well be overlooked, but Senators are being bombarded with telegrams, correspondence and resolutions, expressing horror at the building program approved by the Navy Department and by the President of the United States. I wish to present the matter in light of these propagandists who would persuade us to desist from further shipbuilding.

#### *Submarines and Destroyers*

At the Washington Conference for the Limitation of Naval Armaments it was found to be impossible to agree on doing away with the submarine or upon limitation of submarine tonnage. This inability to restrict a submarine necessarily involved an inability to restrict the destroyer, which was primarily the weapon for use against the submarine. Destroyers vary in tonnage from 750 tons to 2000 tons. Most destroyers are nearer 1000 tons. As they approach 2000 tons they are called destroyers' leaders, having larger accommodations for the commander of the squadron, his aide, and provisions for communications with the squadron by radio and otherwise. In order to effectively limit capital ship tonnage it was essential to define a capital ship. This was done by declaring any ship of over 10,000 tons and armed with over ten 8-inch guns, or with any guns of greater caliber, to be a capital ship. The capital ship was also limited as to armament. The guns could not exceed 16 inches in caliber and as to tonnage, the new capital ships built under the treaty could not exceed 35,000 tons.

#### *The Washington Treaty Incomplete*

The Washington treaty, then, was incomplete in that it failed to place any limitation upon ships of any type of less than 10,000 tons, except the limitation as to the size of gun which could be carried. It would, of course, be possible to put a very large gun on a comparatively small ship. This was Thomas Jefferson's idea of a navy. . . . to have a lot of gunboats, each carrying a single gun as large as the guns carried by a frigate or ship-of-the-line. This scheme was impractical. Under the Washington Treaty, therefore, it

was possible for any one of the treaty powers to at once begin the construction of 10,000 ton ships, armed with 8-inch guns. The number of guns could not exceed ten. It would be possible, by doing entirely without armor, to have a very speedy ship, from 33 to 35 knots, carrying ten 8-inch guns with ammunition for each gun. At the time of this treaty we were completing ten light cruisers. They would be armed with 6-inch guns and were classed by us at 7500-ton cruisers. But the Washington treaty provided for a different method for measuring the tonnage of a ship than the one that we had used. Our system had taken the tonnage of the ship when loaded with a certain amount of supplies and the British had taken the weight of the ship before these supplies were aboard.

#### *Changes in Tonnage*

Under the system adopted these 7500-ton ships became 6600-ton ships. That is, they weighed just as much and were just as large, but the weight of a certain amount of stores and supplies were subtracted from the 7500 tons. Upon the completion of these ships we had 66,000 tons of modern light cruisers. Taking into consideration, however, all the second-line cruisers, older and of slower period, our cruiser tonnage at the opening of the Geneva Conference was slightly superior to the cruiser tonnage of Great Britain then actually constructed. We considered, however, all this cruiser tonnage, other than the 66,000 tons as obsolete. The ships were too slow to perform the functions of a cruiser in modern battle. The Washington Conference by ignoring these older cruisers inferentially declared them obsolete and useless from a military standpoint.

#### *A Replacement Program*

It should be noted that our building program is in a large measure a replacement program. That is to say, a program by which we replace these old cruisers by new ones. A plan by which we replace destroyers arrived at the age of obsolescence by new destroyer leaders, superior to tonnage to these old destroyers, considered as individual ships, but within the tonnage which must be replaced. The submarine tonnage also may be regarded as replacement tonnage, although the new fleet submarine will be superior as a military weapon to the smaller and obsolete submarines which will be replaced by them.

#### *From Washington to Geneva*

To return to the situation which obtained for the period between the Washington Conference and the Geneva Conference, it should be noted that Great Britain began the construction of 10,000-ton, 8-inch gun, or 7½-inch gun, light cruisers. This they had a perfect right to do. Japan also began the construction of this type of cruiser. We, however, did not do so. We hoped for another conference and when Congress finally passed a law authorizing construction of eight 10,000-ton 8-inch gun cruisers, advised the Congress that to match the cruiser tonnage of Great Britain or to place ourselves on the 5-3 ratio with Japan, we would need 22 of such cruisers instead of eight. The law authorizing the construction of these cruisers made no appropriation for them and provided that such construction might be suspended by the President in the event of a conference for the limitation of naval armaments, and he was requested to call such a conference at the earliest opportune moment.

#### *The Geneva Conference*

The Geneva Conference was called by the President of the United States for the express purpose of extending the



treaty ratio to auxiliary craft, cruisers, destroyers and submarines. It would also have included aircraft carriers of less than 10,000 tons. The invitation was accepted by England and Japan and rejected by France and Italy. The conferees failed to agree. It is obvious that if the British proposal had been accepted by the United States and Japan there would have been an agreement. Had the American proposal been accepted by England and Japan there would have been an agreement. There seemed no difficulty in coming to an agreement between Japan and the United States, so that it may be said that if Great Britain had agreed with the United States, Japan would have done so and there would have been an agreement. Japan, however, made it clear that she would not accept the British proposal involving as it did so high a tonnage. In the sense that Great Britain could have agreed with the other two powers and did not do so, the fault is hers. If we had accepted the high tonnage proposed by Great Britain and Japan had failed to do so, it might have been said that the fault was Japan's. But the fact is that there was no agreement because the parties to the conference felt that their national interests did not permit the agreement.

#### *The Surprise at Geneva*

The only surprise sprung in the Geneva Conference was the British proposition that cruisers should be divided into two classes, . . . offensive and defensive, the 8-inch gun cruiser in the former class and the 6000-ton 6-inch gun cruiser to be in the latter class. This ingenious proposition well fitted the needs of the British empire, which had already acquired or were building sufficient 10,000-ton cruisers to meet their needs and were planning to spend the balance of their cruiser money on 6000-ton cruiser operating from the many bases Great Britain has scattered throughout the world. We were not only without such bases, but had agreed not to establish bases in the Far East as a part of our Washington Treaty concessions to the other signatory powers. The other difficulty in the conference was the assertion of Great Britain that she absolutely needed 600,000 tons of cruisers for the protection of her bread lines and trade lines and for operations with the fleet, and this was the absolute minimum of her need.

#### *Japan Disagrees*

Japan felt that she could not agree to so high a tonnage limitation and we felt and stated that such an agreement was not a limitation of armament, but rather an agreement to extend armament. We saw no advantage to others in such an agreement. Instead, we saw distinct disadvantage in this. . . that the number of 10,000-ton cruisers we could build, which could operate successfully from our bases, would be expressly limited and that to attain parity in tonnage with Great Britain we would have to build a large number of 6000-ton, 6-inch gun cruisers, with a small radius of operation, which in view of our agreement not to establish naval bases and our present limited number of bases would be comparatively useless to us. We have estimated that the cost of a cruiser, with its armament, was approximately \$1700 a ton. We would thus be compelled to build between a half and three-quarters of a billion dollars' worth of ships of a type not well adapted to our use in order to attain nominal parity in tonnage with Great Britain, but this parity would be entirely nominal because of the fact that Great Britain could operate these ships and we could not. Her ability to carry her stores and fuel in stock at her naval bases in effect allowed her to keep on shore a part of her cruiser tonnage.

#### *Fuel Needs of American Ships*

It was our necessity for carrying this fuel and this stock of supplies which made it imperative to have the larger tonnage ship. As the larger ship was adapted to the 8-inch gun it seemed wise to use it on such a ship rather than to limit ourselves to the 6-inch gun. We cannot complain of Great Britain that she desired to use her bases to the best advantage and to spread her expenditures into a comparatively large number of smaller cruisers instead of a smaller number of larger cruisers. It should be pointed out, however, that the idea of cutting the cruisers into two classes was entirely new, something not thought of at the time of the Washington agreement. There it was a distinction between capital ships and lesser ships, or the distinction between the ship carrying a gun that threw a projectile weighing 2150 pounds, and one carrying a projectile weighing approximately one-tenth of that, or 250 pounds, that is, the 16-inch gun and the 8-inch gun, but none between 6-inch and 8-inch gun in the Washington treaty.

#### *The American Naval Policy*

Immediately after the Geneva Conference we were called upon to determine and to declare a naval policy. This declaration was made by President Coolidge at Black Hills, South Dakota, shortly after the Geneva Conference. We declared that we would proceed to build up the fleet in accordance with plans which we evolved before the Geneva Conference and the failure of the conference would not cause us to depart from that program. In this connection it may be proper to call attention to the fact that before the Geneva Conference the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Eberle, was called upon by the Senate Naval Committee to state his view concerning the needs of the United States Navy, not to attain parity with Great Britain, but the absolute needs of the Navy based upon our own requirements.

#### *Admiral Eberle's Estimate*

The number of cruisers stated by Admiral Eberle at that time as needed by this government for operation of the fleet and for protection of its coastal trade lines and lines of communication with the fleet, was forty-two. This testimony appeared in the published reports of the hearings before the Naval Committee and was accessible to the naval attaches of all the naval powers. They were thus fully advised by the statement of Admiral Eberle and by the statement of the Secretary of the Navy after the Geneva Conference that we planned to proceed with an orderly development of our fleet based upon our own needs and without any idea of a feverish activity because of the failure of the Geneva Conference. The fundamental reason that the present program is large is that we have not been building ships of the type and quantity needed during the period in which we hoped for a supplemental treaty limiting armament of this type of ship. We did not again desire to scrap new ships. We proposed to wait until the limit was fixed and then build up to that limit instead of repeating what we did in the Washington agreement. . . agree upon a limit and scrap down to that limit. We knew, and it has been stated by the President of the United States, that the Geneva Conference would fix a limit of cruiser, submarine and destroyer tonnage such that we would have to build a large number of cruisers in order to build up to the limitations thus fixed.

In the interests of international peace, we proposed at the Geneva Conference, a limit lower than the estimate of our needs made by Admiral Eberle before that conference,

*Continued on page 32*

## The Modern Naval Cruiser And Its Varied Uses

By Admiral Charles P. Hughes, U. S. N.,

Chief of Naval Operations



RUISERS are second in offensive and defensive power only to the capital ship. They are faster than the capital ship and will overtake, under average sea conditions, all other types of naval and merchant ships. They may give battle on equal or advantageous terms to any but the capital ships.

Some of the cruiser duties may be grouped under the following headings:

### *Battle Between Ships.*

Other factors being equal, the fleet most effectively supported by light cruisers will win the day. The greatest menace to the submarine is the destroyer; likewise the greatest menace to the destroyer is the cruiser. The greatest menace to the capital ship, other than the guns of an opposing capital ship, is the torpedo. Preliminary engagements between light forces, probably before the fleet action is joined, will result in defeat or severe damage to the light forces of one or both sides. A superiority of cruisers will almost certainly decide this result. Destroyers constitute our one present element of naval superiority, but that superiority tends to vanish when unsupported by a cruiser force sufficiently strong to demolish enemy opposition and open the way to a decisive destroyer attack on the enemy capital ships.

### *Screening a Main Body During a Fleet Movement.*

The cruiser is the type of ship which can most effectively screen the main body during a fleet movement and obtain information of the enemy movements. Secrecy regarding location, composition, formation, course and speed is one of the surest aids to movements of the fleet and to the accomplishment of its mission. On the high seas secrecy can be maintained only by denying sight of the fleet to enemy forces. Sight of the fleet may be denied to enemy ships only with ships of sufficient speed and offensive power to drive off or destroy the enemy observing vessels including aircraft carriers.

### *Clearing the Sea of Enemy Raiders*

Another important duty which can best be performed by vessels of the cruiser type is that of clearing the sea of enemy raiders. At the beginning of the World War there were about ten German raiders of various types at large. These raiders were comparatively weak, unsupported by bases in

the theater of operations, and unsupported by larger vessels of their own Navy. It took over 100 British vessels operating for several months to remove these raiders from the sea. Meanwhile, they destroyed a great amount of Allied commerce and seriously interfered with the steady and reliable flow of war material to the British Isles and to the Allies. The tremendous influence that the numerous cruisers which might be opposed to us in war would have on our commerce may be readily visualized. There appears to the Navy Department no way of dealing with such a situation except by cruisers at least equal in power to the cruisers attacking our commerce. Cruisers at sea in search of the enemy will eventually fall in with enemy vessels. If their cruising is to be justified it is then necessary that they be able to bring the enemy vessel to action with a fair chance of success. Vessels inferior in speed or sea-keeping qualities, or in fuel endurance, or in gun power, will not be able to attain their mission. The only assurance that such vessels will be able to act is at least equality of type.

### *Protecting Our Own Commerce.*

The destruction of enemy raiders is the best protection of our own commerce. During the World War we were required by the circumstances then existing to place our merchant vessels, our transports, and supply ships in convoys to guard them against hostile raiders. We had available for this purpose not only the destroyers, which we still have, but a considerable number of armored cruisers and obsolescent battleships. These latter types of vessels are no longer available. The battleships have been scrapped and the cruisers for the most part have so far deteriorated and been outclassed by modern cruisers that they would not answer the purpose.

### *Destroyers.*

One of our greatest assets is in the destroyers of our fleet. These destroyers are relatively helpless against the light cruiser, having 8-inch or 6-inch guns as against 4-inch or 5-inch guns of the destroyer. The speed of the light cruisers is equal to that of the destroyer in a smooth sea, and considerably exceeds that of a destroyer in a heavy sea. Thus, the light cruiser with greater gun range and equal or superior speed can destroy our destroyers with impunity. In order to utilize our superior destroyer tonnage it is important that we should be able to protect our destroyers against the light

cruisers of other powers. It is evident that we should utilize our present destroyer tonnage in any major operation, and to the successful utilization of this tonnage it is essential that we have a large number of light cruisers. It has been suggested that the large number of destroyers we have in reserve constitutes an asset. This is true only if we have a sufficient number of light cruisers to protect these destroyers from the enemy light cruisers.

As to the number of cruisers required by the United States, the number of cruisers required is based primarily upon the necessity for a properly constituted fleet adequate for national defense. This requirement is, of course, dependent partly upon the naval development of other countries. Navies beyond a certain point deal in relative strengths rather than absolute strengths.

The present fleet with its necessary train of auxiliary vessels occupies when it moves at sea, an area not less than 30 miles in diameter. During the movement it will be necessary to guard against surprise attack, to guard the outer part of the formation from any vessel or vessels seeking to penetrate the formation for information or for attack.

#### Guarding Against Surprise.

Naval experience to date indicates that the best way to guard against surprise is by scouting areas far beyond the actual area occupied by the fleet. With a limited number of scouting vessels it is not possible to scout the ocean but only a comparatively narrow band through which the fleet expects to pass. The usual form of protective scouting is to send vessels from 200 to 500 miles in advance of the fleet along its proposed course. Such a scouting line to be effective must be a minimum length of 250 miles. In average weather conditions, the maximum distance between vessels would be not more than 25 miles from which is derived the minimum number of 10 vessels on the advanced scouting line.

#### The Double Scouting Line.

As the fleet moves by day and by night, and as visibility at night is very limited, it is extremely desirable that the scouting line be a double line, so that vessels which pass through the first line during dark will be sighted by the second line during daylight. Lack of vessels may make this second line impossible. Regardless of whether the second line is with the fleet or not, there are required in the fleet formation itself vessels capable of resisting at and beyond the outer edge of the fleet formation any vessel that seeks to force its way into the formation, either for attack or for observation of the fleet. Two minimum number of vessels required for this particular function is 8. Even with this number, the vessels if evenly distributed on the outer fringe of the formation would be some 12 miles apart. It may well happen that attack will be made upon the cruising formation of the fleet by groups of enemy cruisers. It is, therefore, desirable that there be assembled in a central position in the formation a striking group of cruisers ready to oppose an attack coming from any direction and that this striking group of cruisers should number at least eight. Such a group would give a marked increase in the defensive measures of the fleet. This gives a minimum total of twenty-six cruisers required with the fleet in an overseas expedition.

If the fleet moves to distant waters it will never be practicable to take with it all of its cruiser strength, for so to do would leave the enemy free to operate with cruisers against our home ports where it might in a brief space of time do great damage to shipping and interrupt completely the necessary lines of communication not only between home ports and the fleet but between home ports and all external sources of supply. It will, therefore, be necessary to leave cruisers at home in readiness to drive off enemy raiders, to guard shipping at focal points and to protect our seaborne commerce outside the area of active hostilities.—*Extracts, see 16, page 32.*

### The Naval Strength of the United States, Great Britain and Japan

As of October 1, 1928

CAPITAL SHIPS				AIRCRAFT CARRIERS				DESTROYERS									
(i. e.) Battleships and Battle Cruisers				Built and Building				Under Effective Age of 20 Years									
		No.		Tons				Built		Building		Appro. for		Total			
		No.		Tons				No.		Tons		No.		Tons			
United States	....	18	325,350	United States	....	3	78,700	United States	...*	262	312,479	none	none	262	312,479		
British Empire	....	20	556,350	British Empire	....	6	107,550	British Empire	...	166	203,170	9	12,600†	184	228,370		
Japan	.....	10	301,320	Japan	.....	3	63,300	Japan	.....	96	103,160	6	10,200	13	22,100		
* Exclusive of light minelayers and Coast Guard destroyers.																	
† Estimated.																	
CRUISERS																	
Under Effective Age of 20 Years								Over Effective Age of 20 Years									
		Built		Building		Appro. for				Built		Building		Appro. for		Total	
		No.		Tons		No.		Tons		No.		Tons		No.		Tons	
United States	...	10	75,000	3	80,000	none	18	155,000	British Empire	.....	8					5,936	
British Empire	...	54	303,940	8	76,600	2	16,600	64* 397,140	British Empire	.....	3					2,100	
Japan	.....	26	143,959	6	60,000	1	10,000	33 213,955	Japan	.....	4					3,500	
* Includes 2 on disposal list. Excludes 3 (26,600 tons) authorized to be laid down in 1929.																	
Over Effective Age of 20 Years																	
		No.		Tons						No.		Tons					
United States	.....				22		179,425										
British Empire	.....				None		None										
Japan	.....				9		71,434										
The age of these ships vary as follows: United States, 20-35 years. Japan, 24-29 years.																	
SUBMARINES																	
Under Effective Age of 20 Years								Over Effective Age of 20 Years									
		Built		Building		Appro. for				Built		Building		Appro. for		Total	
		No.		Tons		No.		Tons		No.		Tons		No.		Tons	
United States	...	112	83,607	2	5,520	none	114	89,127	United States	.....	10					3,852	
British Empire	...	36	47,705	13	18,480	6	9,240	74 75,435	British Empire	.....	None					None	
Japan	.....	62	58,417	9	14,670	4	6,920	75 80,007	Japan	.....	6					1,749	



## British and Japanese Viewpoints on the Navy Cruiser Problem

### *What Great Britain Thinks*

By Rt. Hon. W. C. Bridgeman, M. P.

*First Lord of the Admiralty*

**A**T GENEVA we made a proposal that the "A" class cruisers of 10,000 tons, with 8-inch guns, should not exceed in number 13 for ourselves, 13 for the United States, and eight for Japan. We also offered there that if the United States and Japan would agree not to build any more of these large cruisers of 10,000 tons, with 8-inch guns, we would not build any more "A" cruisers until the United States had caught us up.

Unfortunately, we were not able to obtain the concurrence of the United States in this plan. They said that they wanted to limit us both to a certain total tonnage for cruisers, 400,000 tons for themselves and for us. They also said that out of that they wished to take 250,000 tons for large cruisers, that is, 25 cruisers of 10,000 tons, and to arm the rest with 8-inch guns instead of the 6-inch guns which we desired. This proposal, that they were to have 25 large cruisers and that we were to have the same number, would have left us with only 150,000 tons for the rest of the cruisers that we wanted. We wanted numbers rather than size; they wanted size rather than numbers. Our ideas turned out to be incompatible, and we could reach no formula which would satisfy both our requirements. What is more, if we had come to an agreement and accepted that proposal, it would not have been a limitation but a very considerable increase. We were called to attend that Conference for limitation, but to have agreed that we were to build about twice as many of these large cruisers as we have now would not have been limitation but a huge addition. For that reason it was quite impossible to accept it.

While I am speaking of this, I should like to refer to a statement that has often been made both in this country and across the Atlantic, and that is that we made an unqualified demand for 600,000 tonnage for cruisers. That is constantly said. . . . We never said that we must have 600,000 tons. . . .

All we mentioned was the numbers that we wanted, the smaller cruisers that we wanted, and that if everyone would agree to that we could agree to a much smaller tonnage, but that if the cruisers were all to be of 10,000 tons, we would be obliged to have 600,000 tons. We never made any unqualified demand for 600,000 tons, but owing to some misunderstanding, many people here and elsewhere seem to have thought so.

The reason why these large cruisers were built at the beginning was because at the Washington Conference 10,000 tons was fixed as the maximum size, and the maximum becomes the standard, and it is only by lowering the maximum that you can get a reduction. We built those ships—the Labour Government built some of them and we built others—because other countries were doing it. Therefore, it became a necessity for us to have ships of equal strength with them.

I think it was a great mistake that the Washington Conference fixed so high a tonnage figure as 10,000 tons and so high a calibre of guns as 8-inch guns. If only the Conference had fixed the tonnage lower and the calibre of the guns lower we should have had very little trouble now. It was in order to come down from that that we made the proposals which we did at Geneva. That was the reason why we proposed that a strict limit, as in battleships, should be applied to these large cruisers, and that after that limit had been fixed no other cruiser should be built except those of a smaller kind. Therefore, it is no sign of inconsistency on our part to say that because we found other nations laying down large 10,000-ton cruisers we had to begin doing the same ourselves, and that when we got the opportunity at the Conference, we tried to persuade other countries to lower the maximum of cruiser tonnage.—*Extracts, see 5, page 32.*

### *What Japan Thinks*

By Mr. M. Osumi

*Vice Minister of Navy*

**W**HILE we have no official reports concerning the statement of the President of the United States advocating the construction of cruisers, we know that this is nothing startling or new; the necessity for the further construction of cruisers by the United States having been repeatedly stated at the tripartite conference in Geneva and again in connection with the Anglo-French naval compromise. We see that, following the victory won in the presidential election by the Republican party, the President has again reaffirmed this same policy.

#### *American Policy Well Known*

This policy is already well known to all countries and it was expected that such a declaration might come at any time, therefore we also see no need for an immediate change of our standing (fixed) naval policy on that account.

I do not think that the President's statement will cause any controversy in other countries as it amounts to each independent state doing that which is necessary for its own protection, and therefore so long as there is no conflict with the restrictions imposed by the arms conference or other similar agreements we have no criticism to offer.

#### *U. S. Weaker in Cruisers Than Great Britain*

The United States is weaker in the ratio of cruiser force as compared with England; and while England may reason that a greater strength in cruisers is unnecessary for a country like the United States which is self supporting; the United States seems to have ideas of her own regarding the necessity for increased cruiser strength, therefore it is not our place to criticize her attitude on this point.—*Extracts, see 4, page 32.*



## The Original Navy Program - 1927

### Provisions of the Butler Construction Bill

*The original building program for the Navy called for the construction of many more vessels than are provided for in the pending bill. This program was embodied in a bill introduced in the House on December 14, 1927, by the late Representative Thomas S. Butler, of Pennsylvania (H. R. 7359), then chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. The Committee, after holding extensive hearings reduced the proposed program to its present proportions of 15 cruisers. The provisions of the Butler bill follow:*



OR the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States the President of the United States is hereby authorized to undertake the construction of the following vessels: Twenty-five light cruisers, nine destroyer leaders, thirty-two submarines, and five aircraft carriers.

Sec. 2. The construction of light cruisers and aircraft

carriers herein authorized shall be subject to the limitations prescribed by the treaty limiting naval armament, ratified August 17, 1923.

Sec. 3. In the event of an international conference for the limitation of naval armaments the President is hereby empowered, in his discretion, to suspend in whole or in part any construction authorized by this Act.

## Provisions of the Pending Cruiser Bill

*The Navy Cruiser Bill, H. R. 11526, was reported to the House from the Committee on Naval Affairs by Representative A. Piatt Andrew, Mass., R., March 3, 1928. The report was signed by all the members of the Committee with the exception of Representative J. V. McClintic, Okla., D., who filed a minority report.*

*The bill passed the House March 17 by a vote of 287 to 58. When it reached the Senate on March 19, it was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. Senator Frederick Hale, Me., R., chairman of that committee, reported the bill to the Senate for the Committee on May 3, with slight amendments. Following is the full text of the bill:*



BE it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to undertake prior to July 1, 1931, the construction of fifteen light cruisers and one aircraft carrier according to the following program:

(a) Five light cruisers during each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1929, 1930 and 1931, to cost, including armor and armament, not to exceed \$17,000,000 each.

(b) One aircraft carrier prior to June 30, 1930, to cost, including armor and armament, not to exceed \$19,000,000: *Provided*, That if the construction of any vessel herein authorized to be undertaken in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929 or 1930, is not undertaken in that fiscal year, such construction may be undertaken in the next succeeding fiscal year: *And provided further*, That the first and each succeeding alternate cruiser upon which work is undertaken, together with the main engines, armor and armament for such light cruisers, the construction and manufacture of which is authorized by this Act, shall be constructed or manufactured in the Government navy yards, naval gun factories, naval ordnance plants, or arsenals of the United States, except such material

or parts thereof as the Secretary of the Navy may find procurable by contract or purchase at an appreciable saving in cost to the Government.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is directed to submit annually to the Bureau of the Budget estimates for the construction of the foregoing vessels.

Sec. 3. The construction of the light cruisers and of the aircraft carrier herein authorized shall be subject to the limitations prescribed by the treaty limiting naval armament, ratified August 17, 1923, so long as such treaty shall remain effective.

Sec. 4. In the event of an international agreement, which the President is requested to encourage, for the further limitation of naval armament, to which the United States is signatory, the President is hereby authorized and empowered to suspend in whole or in part any of the naval construction authorized under this Act.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to present to the Congress on or before December 10, 1928, preliminary plans, specifications and estimates of cost for the construction of two salvage vessels for use in ship disasters.

## President Coolidge on the Cruiser Bill

*Extracts from the Armistice Day Speech*



HE eternal questions before the nations are how to prevent war and how to defend themselves if it comes. There are those who see no answer, except military preparation. But this remedy has never proved sufficient. We do not know of any nation which has ever been able to provide arms enough so as always to be at peace.

Fifteen years ago the most thoroughly equipped people of Europe were Germany and France. We saw what happened. While Rome maintained a general peace for many generations, it was not without a running conflict on the borders which finally engulfed the empire.

But there is a wide distinction between absolute prevention and frequent recurrence, and peace is of little value if it is constantly accompanied by the threatened or the actual violation of national rights.

### *Reasonable Defense Necessary.*

If the European countries had neglected their defenses, it is probable that war would have come much sooner. All human experience seems to demonstrate that a country which makes reasonable preparation for defense is less likely to be subject to a hostile attack and less likely to suffer a violation of its rights which might lead to war. This is the prevailing attitude of the United States and one which I believe should constantly determine its actions.

To be ready for defense is not to be guilty of aggression. We can have military preparation without assuming a military spirit. It is our duty to ourselves and to the cause of civilization, to the preservation of domestic tranquility, to our orderly and lawful relations with foreign people, to maintain an adequate army and navy.

### *Our Present Army Adequate.*

We do not need a large land force. The present size of our Regular Army is entirely adequate, but it should continue to be supplemented by a national guard and reserves, and especially with the equipment and organization in our industries for furnishing supplies. When we turn to the sea the situation is different.

We have not only a long coast line, distant outlying possessions, a foreign commerce unsurpassed in importance, and foreign investments unsurpassed in amount, the number of our people and value of our treasure to be protected, but we are also bound by international treaty to defend the Panama Canal. Having few fueling stations, we require ships of large tonnage, and having scarcely any merchant vessels capable of mounting 5 or 6 inch guns, it is obvious that, based on needs, we are entitled to a larger number of warships than a nation having these advantages.

### *Limitation of Armaments.*

Important however, as we have believed adequate national defense to be for preserving order and peace in the world, we have not considered it to be the only element. We have most urgently and to some degree successfully advocated the principle of the limitation of armaments.

We think this should apply both to land and sea forces, but as the limitation of armies is very largely a European question we have wished the countries most interested to

take the lead in deciding this among themselves. For the purpose of naval limitation we called the Washington conference and secured an agreement as to capital ships and airplane carriers, and also as to the maximum unit tonnage and maximum caliber of guns of cruisers. But the number of cruisers, lesser craft and submarines have no limit.

It no doubt has some significance that foreign governments made agreements limiting that class of combat vessels in which we were superior, but refused limitation in the class in which they were superior.

### *America's Heavy Sacrifice.*

We made altogether the heaviest sacrifice in scrapping work which was already in existence. That should forever remain not only a satisfaction to ourselves, but a demonstration to others of our good faith in advocating the principle of limitation. At that time we had 23 cruisers and 10 more nearly completed. One of these has since been lost, and 22 are nearly obsolete. To replace these, we have started building eight.

The British have since begun and completed seven, are building eight, and have five more authorized. When their present legislation is carried out they would have 68 cruisers. When ours is carried out, we would have 40. It is obvious that, eliminating all competition, world standards of defense require us to have more cruisers.

### *The Geneva Conference.*

This was the situation when I requested another conference, which the British and Japanese attended, but to which Italy and France did not come. The United States there proposed a limitation of cruiser tonnage of 250,000 to 300,000 tons. As near as we could figure out their proposal, the British asked for from 425,000 to 600,000 tons.

As it appeared to us that to agree to so large a tonnage constituted not a limitation, but an extension of war fleets, no agreement was made.

Since that time no progress seems to have been made. In fact, the movements have been discouraging. During last summer France and England made a tentative offer which would limit the kind of cruisers and submarines adapted to the use of the United States, but left without limit the kind adapted to their use. The United States, of course, refused to accept this offer. Had we not done so, the French army and the English navy would be so near unlimited that the principle of limitations would be virtually abandoned. The nations have already accomplished much in the way of limitations and we hope may accomplish more when the preliminary conference called by the League of Nations is reconvened.

### *Other Methods Adopted.*

Meantime, the United States and other nations have been successfully engaged in undertaking to establish additional safeguards and securities to the peace of the world by another method. Throughout all history war has been occurring until it has come to be recognized by custom and practice as having a certain legal standing.

It has been regarded as the last resort, and has too frequently been the first. When it was proposed that this traditional attitude should be modified between the United States and France, we replied that it should be modified among all

nations. As a result, representatives of 15 powers have met in Paris and signed a treaty which condemns recourse to war, renounces it as a national policy, and pledges themselves not to seek to resolve their differences except by peaceful action.

While this leaves the questions of national defense and limitation of armaments practically where they were, as the negative supports of peace, it discards all threat of force and approaches the subject on its positive side.

For the first time in the world the leading powers bind themselves to adjust disputes without recourse to force. While recognizing to the fullest extent the duty of self-defense, and not undertaking, as no human ingenuity could undertake, an absolute guarantee against war, it is the most complete and will be the most effective instrument for peace that was ever devised.

So long as promises can be broken and treaties can be

violated we can have no positive assurances, yet every one knows they are additional safeguards. We can only say that this is the best that mortal man can do. It is beside the mark to argue that we should not put faith in it. The whole scheme of human society, the whole progress of civilization, requires that we should have faith in men and in nations.

#### *A Practical Principle of Peace.*

There is no other positive power on which we could rely. All the values that have ever been created, all the progress that has ever been made, declare that our faith is justified.

For the cause of peace the United States is adopting the only practical principles that have ever been proposed, of preparation, limitation and renunciation. The progress that the world has made in this direction in the last 10 years surpasses all the progress ever before made.—*Extracts, see 17, page 32.*

### *From the President's Annual Message to Congress*



HE first duty of our Government to its own citizens and foreigners within its borders is the preservation of order. Unless and until that duty is met a government is not even eligible for recognition among the family of nations. The advancement of world civilization likewise is dependent upon that order among the people of different countries which we term peace. To insure our citizens against the infringement of their legal rights at home and abroad, to preserve order, liberty and peace by making the law supreme, we have an Army and a Navy.

Both of these are organized for defensive purposes. Our Army could not be much reduced, but does not need to be increased. Such new housing and repairs as are necessary are under way and the 5-year program in aviation is being put into effect in both branches of our service.

#### *Our Navy Deficient in Cruisers.*

Our Navy, according to generally accepted standards, is deficient in cruisers. We have 10 comparatively new vessels, 22 that are old, and 8 to be built. It is evident that renewals and replacements must be provided. This matter was thoroughly canvassed at the last session of the Congress and does not need restatement. The bill before the Senate with the elimination of the time clause should be passed. We have no intention of competing with any other country. This building program is for necessary replacements and to meet our needs for defense.

#### *Stupendous Cost of National Defense.*

The cost of national defense is stupendous. It has increased \$118,000,000 in the past four years. The estimated

expenditure for 1930 is \$668,000,000. While this is made up of many items it is, after all, mostly dependent upon numbers. Our defensive needs do not call for any increase in the number of men in the Army or the Navy. We have reached the limit of what we ought to expend for that purpose.

#### *Neither Militaristic Nor Imperialistic.*

I wish to repeat again for the benefit of the timid and the suspicious that this country is neither militaristic nor imperialistic. Many people at home and abroad, who constantly make this charge, are the same ones who are even more solicitous to have us extend assistance to foreign countries. When such assistance is granted, the inevitable result is that we have foreign interests. For us to refuse the customary support and protection of such interests would be in derogation of the sovereignty of this Nation.

#### *Our Interests in Europe.*

Our largest foreign interests are in the British Empire, France and Italy. Because we are constantly solicitous for those interests, I doubt if anyone would suppose that those countries feel we harbor toward them any militaristic or imperialistic design. As for smaller countries, we certainly do not want any of them. We are more anxious than they are to have their sovereignty respected. Our entire influence is in behalf of their independence. Cuba stands as a witness to our adherence to this principle.

The position of this Government relative to the limitation of armaments, the results already secured, and the developments up to the present time are so well known to the Congress that they do not require any restatement.—*Extracts, see 18, page 32.*

## *Mr. Hoover on National Defense*

### *From His Speech of Acceptance*



THINK I may say that I have witnessed as much of the horror and suffering of war as any other American. From it I have derived a deep passion for peace. Our foreign policy has one primary object, and that is peace. We have no hates; we wish no further possessions; we harbor no military threats.

#### *Maintenance of Peace.*

There are two co-operating factors in the maintenance of peace—the building of good will by wise and sympathetic handling of international relations, and the adequate preparedness for defense. We must not only be just; we must be respected. Our offer of treaties open to the signature of all,

renouncing war as an instrument of national policy, proves that we have every desire to co-operate with other nations for peace. Our country has refused membership in the League of Nations, but we are glad to co-operate with the League in its endeavors to further scientific, economic, and social welfare and to secure limitation of armament.

#### *Assurance of Liberty.*

We are particularly desirous of furthering the limitation of armaments. But we must and shall maintain our naval defense and our merchant marine in the strength and efficiency which will yield to us at all times the primary assurance of liberty, that is, of national safety.—*Extracts, see 19, page 32.*



## Should Uncle Sam Build More Cruisers?

Pro

HON. FREDERICK HALE,  
U. S. Senator, Maine, Republican

**I**T is the duty of Congress to provide and maintain the navy of the United States. It is the duty of Congress to see that an adequate navy is maintained. If we make any mistake in our estimate of what constitutes an adequate navy, it is far better that the mistake should be on the side of providing and maintaining too large rather than too small a navy. The extravagance, while of course not advisable, will not be fatal to us as a Nation. If we err on the other side, on the contrary, we may have to pay for it with our very lives.

The navy must at all times be prepared for instant service; that is, be in a state of readiness for war or other emergency. When called upon to act it must be in condition to act effectively. It is the first line of defense against the enemy, and it must hold the enemy in check until the army, which is not in time of peace kept on a war time basis, can be mobilized and made ready for action.

Within the next few years the first part of the replacement program must be begun. It is vital to us that before we come to that time as far as possible we get the navy up to the full strength which our naval policy demands, so that such a new program shall not have to be met at the same time as the natural replacement program.

When in November, 1921, the Conference on Limitation of Armament met at Washington we had in process of construction 9 battleships and 6 battle cruisers.

On these ships \$150,000,000 had already been spent. Had all of these ships been completed and added to our naval forces and had a sufficient number of cruisers, submarines, carriers, and other auxiliary ships been laid down properly to round out the navy, we would have had a navy powerful enough to withstand all of the navies of the world now in existence combined. This naval supremacy we gave up at the conference, and in exchange for it we secured a basis of limitation on capital ships and carriers. This agreement we were able to bring about on account of our great superiority in battleships and battle cruisers built and building, and on account of the impossibility of the other nations concerned competing with our program.

The sacrifice made due to the conference was made largely by the United States, and the advantage gained by the United States was the establishment of a ratio whereby we were to have a navy equal to that of any nation in the world, and whereby the status of our possible naval competitors was established.

It is to be regretted that when we held this "whip hand" and were willing to give it up, we did not get more in exchange for doing so. It is greatly to be regretted that a limitation could not have been definitely arranged on other classes of ships where instead of being ourselves predominant we were weaker than some of the other nations party to the treaty.

We did not need to summon the great powers to a conference here to ask their permission to scrap \$150,000,000 worth of our own ships under construction.

*Continued on next page*

Con

HON. WILLIAM H. KING,  
U. S. Senator, Utah, Democrat

**I**N my opinion, the premises of the militarists and navalists are wrong. Many of them occupy similar positions to those held by the German militarists prior to the World War, and many of the arguments employed by the leaders of the former German Empire to support their military policies and demands for "preparedness" are urged in our own country to compel Congress to expend hundreds of millions annually in preparations for war.

In making this statement I am not opposing reasonable appropriations for the maintenance of our Army and Navy. I have upon various occasions advocated a naval plan that would give to the United States an adequate, modern, and up-to-date Navy.

I have opposed archaic plans of the Naval Board and condemn some of their reactionary policies. When the naval authorities insisted upon expending one and a half billion dollars to carry out the 1916 naval program I opposed it. The Naval Board fought for this plan and its execution in the face of the experiences and lessons of war. To them the battleship was not only the foundation but the structure of the Navy. The submarine and airplane and the naval craft and naval weapons which the Great War demonstrated were essential to a modern navy, was accorded but insignificant place in the categories prepared by them of needed naval vessels.

It is my view that the United States has fallen short in its efforts to promote world peace and to bring about world disarmament. In the present situation our country, of course, must maintain an adequate Navy—one that is modern and properly balanced with reference to the types and categories of naval craft. For such a Navy I shall give my hearty support. To a military policy—a policy that ignores the high responsibilities resting upon this Nation of leading the world into the path of peace, of developing an international spirit of comity and, indeed, affection—I shall not give my support.

This nation, because of its favored position geographically and otherwise, should lead the world in every movement to promote peace and prevent war.

The apostles of militarism and of so-called "preparedness" are clamorous, and with fanatical zeal carry forward their crusades in our own country. A vigorous campaign has been waged and is being carried on in favor of stupendous appropriations by Congress for military purposes. Efforts are made to excite the fears of the people that the United States is menaced by powerful foes, and that unless hundreds of millions are immediately expended for so-called military and naval defense, our country will be plunged into a titanic conflict.

And the militaristic clique, appreciating that the great mass of mankind, absorbed as they are in the burdens of their daily toil, do not give sufficient thought to the formulation of ways and means to promote peace and end war, play upon their credulity, and attempt to lead them to believe that

*Continued on next page*



## Pro

HON. FREDERICK HALE—*Continued.*

To my mind, the important thing that we got out of the whole treaty was the agreement, however incomplete it may have been, to this 5-5-3 ratio, and the notification to the rest of the world that that was the basis upon which we purposed to keep up our Navy.

If we have not kept up this ratio, we have not done what the American people have expected us to do. That we are falling back on this ratio strength in ships other than capital ships and carriers is true.

It seems to me that pending the reaching of a further agreement on the limitation of armament the only thing that we can do, taking into consideration our American stand for the 5-5-3 ratio, properly to take care of our own naval needs is to keep up a reasonable and adequate strength in all three classes of ships, other than capital ships and carriers, that as far as possible will give us the ratio strength.

The newspapers of the country have had a good deal to say about the action of the other nations party to the treaty on the limitation of armament. They have criticized these other nations for not living up to the 5-5-3 ratio and have criticized them for going ahead with large building programs.

There is no ground whatever for such criticism. There is no obligation, express or implied, on any other nation party to the treaty to limit its ships, other than capital ships and carriers, in any way.

An attempt was made to reach such limitation at the Geneva Conference. That attempt failed; and, having failed, each country is at liberty to take what action it sees fit in relation to ships other than capital ships and carriers.

It was the United States that initiated the effort to apply the ratio to these ships. It was the American point of view, later subscribed to by Great Britain and Japan, that the limitation should be made. It was not made.

Much has been said about the holding of a future conference on limitation of armament. The naval appropriation bills for the last few years have included a clause asking the President to call such a conference. The difficulties of so doing are not, I think, fully appreciated by the country. We were able to bring about the Washington Conference and to bring about the results achieved at the conference largely, because of our great preponderance of capital-ship strength, built and building. Impoverished as were all of the nations parties to the agreement by the World War, not one of them could in any way have hoped to compete with the United States in a building program. The proposition of the United States voluntarily to abandon its superior position was more than welcome to the other nations. The generous proposition of the United States brought about the success of the conference.

We are now in no such position of superiority. The basis of capital-ship strength is established. The application of the ratio to ships other than capital ships and carriers would involve not a sacrifice on our part of established strength but a sacrifice on the part of other nations who, in certain of these classes, with their ships on hand and their building programs, are our superiors.

We must, therefore, approach the question of a new conference on limitation of armaments not as a great country willing to make a great sacrifice in the interests of world

*Continued on next page*

## Con

HON. WILLIAM H. KING—*Continued.*

their lives and their countries are in danger, which can only be averted by withdrawing millions of men and women from industry, training them for war, and arming them with deadly weapons and poison gases for the destruction of millions of their fellow men.

This powerful Nation is menaced by no country. Unfortunately, the strident tones and the clamorous voices of a small minority in our country are carried beyond the seas and are calculated to arouse the fears and suspicions of peoples and governments desiring peace and who recognize the primacy of this Republic and would be willing to follow it in every reasonable plan in the interest of international fellowship.

Generalizing, it may be said that the motives of the United States are questioned and fear is entertained as to the international course which this Republic will pursue.

A wise and just course will eradicate these apprehensions. We hold the keys that will unlock the hearts of the world. The United States can enter the sacred precincts of humanity's affection. We must not throw away this great opportunity for service and leadership.

It would seem that the number of 10,000-ton, 8-inch gun cruisers which Great Britain requires as reasonably necessary for her protection and the protection of her dominions would be adequate for the United States. If this view had been adopted at the Geneva conference, the British might have proceeded to build such number of 6,000-ton, 6-inch gun class, as they required as their necessary complement, unstimulated by the competitive building of vessels of this class upon our part, for which, our naval authorities say, we have no special need.

There is nothing in the attitude of any country to justify this military hysteria which possesses some Americans. Whom have we to fear on this hemisphere? Between the United States and Canada there is the utmost good will. The future will witness a growing regard and indeed affection between the peoples of the United States and Canada.

Is it not time for the people of the United States to take the lead in bringing peace on earth and good will among men? Our financial power in the world is recognized. America should wear the crown of moral leadership. The great World War should have taught us, as well as other nations, the folly of war and the futility of great military operations. Nations that prepare for war usually have war.

In a little over four years of war more than 7,146,000 of the flower of the allied nations gave their lives on battle fields; more than 12,000,000 were wounded, and more than 4,600,000 were missing. Germany and her allies lost more than 4,650,000 killed, and those who were wounded numbered more than 8,500,000. It is impossible to compute the direct losses measured in money; and the indirect losses can not be comprehended.

The expenses of the war and the property loss have been estimated at between three and four hundred billion dollars; and still war is a "legal institution" and the world is oppressed with demands to maintain armies and military establishments and construct mighty navies, realizing, as we must, that they will not prevent war, but, indeed, will be quite

*Continued on next page*

## Pro

HON. FREDERICK HALE—*Continued.*

limitation of armament but as a country asking others to make the sacrifice. The shoe is now very much on the other foot.

We have come out of the recent World War in a relatively more commanding position than we went into it. We are without question the envy of the rest of the world.

We can not count on consideration in the councils of the civilized powers due to affection for us as a people or to gratitude for any service that we may have rendered in the past. We must be prepared to look after ourselves and our interests.

The greatest factor in the world for peace in my estimation is a rich and powerful America insisting that peace shall be maintained.—*Extracts, see 2, page 32.*

## Pro

HON. FRED A. BRITTEN,

U. S. Representative, Illinois, Republican.



HIS bill is like fire insurance. A protection for an emergency.

A professor of Swarthmore University came before the House Committee on Naval Affairs and offered his advice. He said we ought to have a Navy composed of small gunboats, such as we have on the Great Lakes, and when they become obsolete we should not replace them. When asked about heavy guns, he said, "Why should we fight; why should we think of fighting?" I remarked that President Coolidge said that "war was accidental." Well, war is accidental.

Of the 21 members of this committee all but one were unanimous for this bill. We sat for weeks taking testimony of all sorts of individuals, experts, pacifists, and near-Communists. One of our witnesses was referred to in the New York Herald-Tribune editorially as a nationally known international anarchist. But we heard them all. Then we sat down in executive session, and this bill was the result. I really think the bill is a better bill for the national defense than the bill that was originally sent to the Congress by the President of the United States, which provided for 74 as against these 16. This provides for a time limit on them, of course. I am not going into the figures, because they have been ably presented already, but there was a lot of opposition to any great expansion of the Navy. That opposition came from a number of so-called peace societies, pacifists and communists societies. The larger of the group were the Church Peace Union and the World's Alliance for International Friendship. Those two organizations are very big ones and do business under the Carnegie Foundation fund. They were represented by four of their executive trustees. Of the four, three of them were for a navy. The other one was the gentlemen I just referred to a little while ago as being referred to as an international anarchist. The spokesman for these two great church organizations said that they represent between 30,000,000 and 50,000,000 Christian churchgoers, and he wound up his testimony by saying that pending an international conference agreement for the reduction or limitation of armaments:

"We are for the spirit of the Washington Conference, the 5-5-3 ratio."

It is well known that England is stronger than we are

*Continued on next page*

## Con

HON. WILLIAM H. KING—*Continued.*

likely to provoke war. During the past seven years the United States has pursued a cynical attitude toward all efforts to promote world peace. We refused to join the League of Nations or become a member of the World Court or participate in the conferences of the league, where efforts have been made and are being made to devise some practical plan of limiting military armament and removing the causes of war.

I repeat, the material strength and financial resources of the United States demand that it assume the responsibility of world leadership to outlaw war and bring international good will. Our disclaimers of any desire for conquest will not be sufficient. The need of world leadership was never so great.—*Extracts, see 13, page 32.*

## Con

HON. RALPH F. LOZIER,

U. S. Representative, Missouri, Democrat



T SEEMS to me there is no occasion for war and no probability of any within the life of any person now living in the United States. I decline to be stamped by propaganda about the probability of another war. This story that we might become involved in war with Great Britain and Japan is simply preposterous. There will never be a war between the two great English-speaking nations. England has too much involved to provoke a quarrel or a military contest with the United States. In the event of a war between Great Britain and the United States, England knows the first thing we would do would be to take Canada, her choicest colonial possession. England, by reason of her far-flung empire, must necessarily have a larger navy than any other nation, because England is mistress of the sea. When Lord Nelson destroyed the French fleet at Aboukir, Napoleon Bonaparte said: "Wherever wood can swim, there I am sure to find this flag of England." And on another occasion he said: "To France the fates have decreed the empire of the land, to England that of the sea."

Since the curtain went up on human history there have been innumerable instances where nations with great navies have been destroyed by nations having smaller navies, and also where mighty nations with great armies and seemingly irresistible military power and equipment have been defeated and destroyed by nations having but little military equipment and power.

No nation has ever been able to permanently perpetuate itself by maintaining a large military and naval establishment. Every great nation that has relied on military or naval power has ultimately met defeat and disaster. Call the roll from the centuries cluttered with the shattered fragments of nations that relied on their armies and navies. If we are depending on military and naval prowess we are building our national edifice on shifting sands.

Now, let us consider these modern battleships. You can take one of these battleships which cost \$17,000,000, and with a bombing airplane which can be built for some \$50,000 to \$80,000, you can destroy the \$17,000,000 battleship. It seems to me that no one who has even superficially studied naval history can contend that our national defense depends

*Continued on next page*

## Pro

HON. FRED A. BRITTEN—Continued.

in battleships. Every person who came before the committee, including these church organizations, realized that England is stronger than we are in battleship strength. One of those who represented the church organizations was Dr. Gordon, a dignified and learned man, who went to the Geneva Conference as a listener-in. He told the committee that in his opinion we were weaker than England in battleship strength and that is quite correct.

I think we made a great mistake in scrapping our modern ships. The only thing that caused the failure of the Geneva Conference was the refusal of Great Britain to scrap her modern ships. Let me go a little further on this matter of tonnage. This bill is not in conflict with the Washington Conference, nor is it in conflict with the proposals of our delegates to the Geneva Conference. We offered to meet with England at 300,000 tons cruiser strength. England came down to 590,000 tons, and finally was willing to come down to about 400,000 tons under certain conditions. So that no portion of this program when completed will ever be scrapped. It is inconceivable to presume that the British or the Japanese will ever scrap down to meet these figures, we are so far below them.—*Extracts, see 2, page 32.*

## Pro

CHARLESTON (W. VA.) MAIL

## Editorial



**RESIDENT COOLIDGE'S** speech on Armistice Day seems to have aroused more excitement than any utterance he has made since he has occupied the Presidential chair. As usual, all kinds of interpretations have been put upon it. Yet the words of the President seem to be clear enough; first to maintain the United States Navy in a proper state of efficiency; second, to maintain it on the basis of the ratio agreed upon with other nations.

There should be nothing alarming in this either to Americans or to other nations. It does not mean war with nations. It does not mean war with Great Britain or any other nation. It means self-protection, and reasonable naval self-protection.

The two foremost nations in the world today are the United States and Great Britain, and these are the two nations that have learned that the differences which arise between them are best settled by other means than a recourse to war. They have learned this salutary lesson through experience.

Great Britain needs a large navy. An empire so broadly extended that in truth the sun never sets on its dominions must have a navy to protect this far-flung expanse. The head and heart of this vast empire are the British Isles, a country which cannot produce its own bread and meat or provide its own clothing. Those who think that Great Britain will destroy its navy hold to the peculiar idea that Great Britain contemplates national suicide.

The United States, while it has out-lying possessions, is not as yet in the same predicament as Great Britain and possibly some other European nations. Nevertheless, we have a great sea coast and do need a reasonable defensive navy. We do not want a navy for the purpose of trying to dominate the seas. But we do want a respectable navy,

*Continued on next page*

## Con

HON. RALPH F. LOZIER—Continued.

upon these ponderous battleships, because they are so easily destroyed by submarines and airplanes.

But if we concede for the sake of argument that these cruisers and this aircraft carrier can be built for \$274,000,000, it does not follow that this bill should pass. Indeed, there is more than \$274,000,000 involved in this proposal. It is my mature judgment that the passage of this bill will definitely commit our Government to a big navy building program that will in the next few years cost the American people between one and two, yes, probably four billion dollars.—*Extracts, see 2, page 32.*

## Con

WHEELING (W. VA.) REGISTER

## Editorial



**RESIDENT COOLIDGE'S** recent "rattling of the sabre act" has thrown all Europe as well as this country into a "fit of uncertainty." Many "ifs" spring to tongue. If the Kellogg pact is not a mere concert of international singing with eyes to heaven and hands on pistols, why the necessity of increased cruiser building? If the pact is worth while and binding, why does President Coolidge advocate more cruisers for fear of failure of ratification in the Senate? If he does not so fear, then why not say something about America's sacred obligation to join the World Court and make for peaceful international law?

Recently British Prime Minister Baldwin delivered a most conciliatory address for American consumption upon naval affairs as follows:

"Our policy in naval building is to go slow. We have no intention of competing with the United States, and we came to our decision to go slow long before we were asked to sign the Kellogg pact.

"We are grateful to Mr. Kellogg for bringing that treaty to Europe. It gives us what in our spiritual life we should be grateful for—an opportunity for a fresh start. I doubt whether the world yet realizes the full import of the Kellogg pact.

"I want to see things in such shape that the American people shall look upon every British cruiser as an additional pledge of their security; that the British people shall look upon every American cruiser as a pledge of their security, and that, both of them looking at things in this way, we shall together need as few cruisers as possible. That is what I want."

In the face of these utterances, the only possible way of explaining President Coolidge's demand for more cruisers larger and more heavily gunned, is that he, like former Ambassador Morganthau believes the Kellogg pact a futile instrument. Here is Mr. Morganthau's view:

"It is not America's best means of realizing a sincere desire to help the world. It is not a constructive peace.

"It will not accomplish what the Europeans want of it—namely to involve us in a new balance of power. An open and frank discussion of the pact in the Senate will prevent its ratification. If the five or six great powers really, sincerely wanted peace, they could have it and an unwritten understanding would be all that would be required to insure it.

"Since the Great War all European nations have been busily trying to arrange a new balance of power among

*Continued on next page*



## Pro

## CHARLESTON (W. VA.) MAIL—Continued

The question is by no means a theoretical one. It is as practical a question as any we have, and in some respects as simple. The same rule holds as to our navy as to any other thing in American life. We equip our factories, not with old and worn-out machinery, but with the very newest and latest. When we have only obsolete naval vessels while other nations have naval vessels embodying all the latest applications of inventions, we simply have a navy on paper and not a navy in reality. In view of modern requirements, the proposal for construction of new cruisers is neither startling nor alarming.

The construction of these vessels does not interfere with the ratification of the multilateral treaty. If any results of an international effect accrue, it would seem to be that this result would be hastening the general ratification of the treaty. The text of the proposed multilateral treaty does not call for absolute disarmament—land or naval. If it did, not a nation would ratify it. Rather, one would imagine, two armed nations would be more ready to enter an agreement not to attack one another than two harmless ones.—*Extracts, see 8, page 32.*

## Pro

## WASHINGTON POST.

## Editorial



HE American people have overwhelmingly approved President Coolidge's Armistice Day address, in which he sets forth American policy.

American policy as outlined by President Coolidge is not open to criticism by any American or foreigner who is devoted to world peace. It is covered by three words—preparation, limitation and renunciation. By preparation is meant the provision of suitable defense, so that, whether the nations keep the faith or not, the United States will be safe. By limitation is meant genuine agreement faithfully observed limiting the world's great navies and eliminating competitive building. By renunciation is meant the ratification of the Kellogg treaty and its faithful observance by all nations.

If all nations will adopt the policy which the United States has adopted there will be peace, relief from armament burdens and general security based upon the ability of each national to defend itself.

The world's peoples support this policy. Some of the chief governments have betrayed their own peoples by refusing to put this policy into effect. Men who temporarily direct the policies of their governments have entered into agreements, partly secret, having for their object the supremacy of the British navy and the French army, in absolute disregard of any honest rule of limitation of armaments. These agreements having been exposed and denounced by the people of Great Britain, the British Government drops them, or tries to do so; but it appears that the French Government holds Britain to its agreement in respect to the increase of French military power.

British public opinion greatly regrets the impairment of confidence that now marks the relations between Britain and the United States. The reasons for this loss of confidence are clear. They are caused by the failure of British authorities to keep good faith with the United States. When it was agreed in Washington in 1922 that the spirit of the arms limitation treaty contemplated parity of naval strength as

*Continued on next page*

## Con

## WHEELING (W. VA.) REGISTER—Continued

themselves. European statesmen have gradually realized, however, that there can be no permanent balance of world power that does not include the United States. This country, through its financial strength and through the military power which it demonstrated it possessed during the war, is really the balance of the power. Europe now knows that the United States would determine the victor in any great future world war, because that side with which the United States would align itself would undoubtedly win.

"The Kellogg Pact is emasculated by the written reservations of France and England, the written reservations of other countries and by all the reservations besides; so that, in the final analysis, the ceremonial signing at Paris simply amounted to a great serio-comic spectacle—a sort of Gilbert and Sullivan opera with all star performers and all singing the one song, 'We Will Not Throw the First Stone, But God Protect the Nation that Does.' For the moment that anyone throws the first stone all other nations are released from the pact. They have only to pronounce the magic phrase, 'self-defense, and go to war by the old rules.'"—*Extracts, see 9, page 32.*

## Con

## DES MOINES REGISTER

## Editorial



HERE has never been any covering up on the part of the British of what they regard as parity in navies. Their case was stated very plainly to the visiting American editors by Lord Birkenhead, and also by Sir Austin Chamberlain. Britain centers in two little islands no larger than Iowa and Minnesota having 50,000,000 people who never have more than seven weeks' food supply ahead. The world-round empire is connected by the British cruiser and held together by the British cruiser. This distinctive British cruiser for commercial purposes is a smaller boat of lower gun power than the regular battle cruiser. The British contend it is not properly a war vessel at all. In any event, Britain and America being so differently situated, naval parity should bear some relation to difference of needs.

It was this dispute over cruisers of smaller size and lower gun range that broke up the Geneva conference and immediately started the United States off on a program of naval enlargement without reference to Europe.

There was in the British-French agreement more than an agreement to the British program of smaller cruisers. Britain in return agreed to an unlimited number of smaller submarines which are peculiarly suited to French needs. Britain also consented to unlimited land forces.

This British-French agreement has been dropped, largely because of our protest but that apparently is having no influence in Washington.

It is easy to agree with everything our department said in its protest against the British-French agreement. Such an agreement instead of working for world disarmament would in effect enormously aggravate the situation, and the world is today armed as never before. It is fortunate that it has been dropped. But on what theory are we going to enlarge our navy, if as a matter of fact we are contemplating any sort of coming together to secure gradual disarmament?

As we ask this question it is interesting to go back to what President Coolidge said in his inaugural three years ago and

*Continued on next page*



## Pro

WASHINGTON POST—Continued

between the United States and Great Britain it was not dreamed by Americans that Great Britain would immediately begin to build large cruisers, of battleship speed and effectiveness, and thus reestablish British sea supremacy. President Coolidge was faced with the alternative of building up the American fleet or inviting the sea powers to make genuine limitation effective. He chose the latter alternative and called the Geneva Conference. There his proposal to restore British-American naval parity was rejected. Later the Franco-British accord was reached, having for its object the permanent inferiority of the United States Navy as compared with the British navy.

It is little wonder that President Coolidge now makes American policy clear. He proposes that the United States shall provide such naval defense as will make its rights and commerce secure, whether the world is at war or at peace; that the nations shall renounce war; and that the great powers shall agree to genuine and equitable limitation of naval armaments.

The promotion of world peace depends upon the co-operation of foreign governments in this equitable policy. They can fail to pay their debts, if they wish, but Mr. Coolidge suggests that the United States can afford to lose these debts better than the debtors can afford not to pay them. They can evade limitation agreements, if they wish, but Mr. Coolidge reminds them that the United States is not suggesting limitation because of any lack of ability to outbuild all other powers. They can break faith after ratifying the Kellogg treaty, if they wish, but if they count the cost they will not do so.

Whatever course may be taken by the directors of foreign governments, it is evident that the peoples of the world stand behind the policy outlined by Mr. Coolidge. The United States has but one duty to perform. That duty is to provide for suitable defense, to ratify the Kellogg treaty, and to make sure that any further overtures for limitation of armaments shall be made in good faith.—*Extracts, see 10, page 32.*

## Pro

MONTGOMERY (ALA.) ADVERTISER

## Editorial

President Coolidge in his Armistice Day address showed more spirit and fire than is his wont. His address undoubtedly will be better received in his own country than in Europe. He laid down two propositions. The first was that we are not interested in financing the building up of foreign navies by means of great credit advances; the second was that our own position as a naval power must be improved by the immediate construction of a number of battle cruisers. The President suggested that the time had come when we should think less of advancing loans to Europe and more about caring for our own needs; he hinted strongly that we had about done enough to put Europe on its feet economically in these ten years that have passed since the war.

Mr. Coolidge took pains to leave no doubt that he is sympathetic with the principle of naval reduction; he does not desire another race for naval supremacy between this country and its rivals. At the same time, we have neglected our navy and let it run down since 1921 when we entered into an agreement with the other naval powers to limit naval armaments. We have let Great Britain run far ahead of us in the construction of cruisers. Mr. Coolidge, however, should not

*Continued on page 19*

## Con

DES MOINES REGISTER—Continued

in his message to congress two years ago. In his inaugural he said referring to the Washington conference, "Our navy ranks larger in comparison than it ever did before." In his message he said "No navy in the world with one exception approaches ours and none surpasses it." In his inaugural he called for a display of reason rather than a display of force and said "If we expect others to rely on our fairness and justice we must show that we rely on their fairness and justice." And yet his recent Armistice Day address was wholly an appeal to the United States to compel respect by show of force, and his message to Congress will without any doubt emphasize the importance of our leading the world in naval power.

On the face of it Britain and the United States are drifting rapidly and widely apart. It is not half so important to decide who is responsible as it is to recognize the fact. All the soft words in the dictionary will not blind anybody's eyes who has read history even cursorily. And they are drifting apart over the purely technical question of what sort of vessels an empire needs that is widely scattered as compared with a nation that centers on one continent and has an ocean to separate it from its rivals.

In the end the question is bound to be raised whether the Geneva Conference was called in good faith, or was intended merely as gesture to convince the American people that it was the unreasonableness of Britain that was forcing our hands in the matter of navy building. Certainly the complete change on the part of President Coolidge will call for some explanation. He called the Geneva Conference quite tentatively and immediately backed away from it to his big navy program.—*Extracts, see 11, page 32.*

## Con

THE NEW YORK WORLD

## Editorial

President Coolidge's Armistice Day speech, unfortunate in itself, now appears still more regrettable in the echoes it aroused. Dozens of such newspapers as the Chicago Tribune have seized it as the text for hard-boiled nationalistic utterances on the debts, a big navy and the trickiness of European diplomacy. Abroad it has provoked the resentment of not merely hot-headed Paris and Rome newspapers and such men as Lord Birkenhead, but of even the sober English weeklies. Yesterday's Washington correspondence of The World and other journals predicted that it would be the cue for vigorous debates as soon as Congress met.

While Englishmen like Lord Grey and Lloyd George are making speeches admirable for their moderate and conciliatory tone, it behooves American lovers of peace to keep their attention on the main questions. The talk aroused by Mr. Coolidge's indiscretions will soon die down. What is much more important than talk is the action we are going to take on two leading measures. Will the impending session of the Senate ratify the Kellogg Treaty? Will Congress in this session pass an unnecessarily large naval bill or not? The answer given these two questions will show the world whether we are sincere in our wishes for peace or not.

The outlook for prompt ratification of the Kellogg Treaty, a few weeks ago entirely sunny, has now become clouded. Mr. Coolidge's speech and the reaction to it abroad will inevitably embarrass and delay the compact. The advocates of the fifteen-cruiser bill will try to hold it back and to exploit the weakness of Mr. Borah and others who are willing to

*Continued on page 19*

## Does U. S. Navy Need Fifteen Cruisers

Pro

HON. FREDERICK H. GILLET,†

U. S. Senator, Massachusetts, Republican



WHEN the naval bill was before the Senate two years ago I voted against the appropriation for cruisers. I hoped that the naval conference then impending might make their construction unnecessary, or that at any rate it would result in some agreement under which we could project a definite and permanent mutual program. I thought England needed an economical and reduced program more than we did, and would probably agree to reasonable restrictions. Moreover, I felt that a breach with England was almost as improbable as it was baneful; that despite our polyglot population there was a general harmony of our aims and purposes and instincts with those of Great Britain which would make war with her very unlikely and which would lead the two nations to stand together as a common bulwark for the peace of the world. I felt great sympathy with her economic and industrial condition and with her outlook for the future, burdened with a heavier load of taxation than any nation ought to carry; and I thought, although she bore it with marvelous grit, she would welcome the opportunity which the naval conference offered for a great and permanent tax reduction.

But I was mistaken. Apparently her traditional impulse that Britannia shall rule the waves was stronger than her economic necessities, and she preferred to excite our rivalry rather than our cooperation. Perhaps that ought not to surprise us. When a nation has for generations been saturated with the conviction that her safety depended on a navy superior to any other power, when the glorious exploits of that navy had furnished the proudest records of her military annals as well as the surest bulwarks of her defense, thus winning the support of both national sentiment and national interest, and when this very generation has owed its salvation to that historic naval policy, it would not be easy to renounce it, and it would be dangerous for any administration to openly discard it. I make allowance for those conditions, and I do not mean to permit myself to be influenced by pique or affront or to be driven from one extreme to another; but in calmly considering the whole situation and the probabilities of the future, I have concluded that I must revise the fundamental principles which have governed me and must favor a more extensive and formidable force at sea than I had hoped would ever be necessary. Much is said about not engaging in competitive building, but building only for our own needs. But our needs depend on our competitors. If no other nation had any vessels which could be used for making war, our safety would require none. And while it is disagreeable to contemplate any war, and much more a war with any particular nation, yet so long as other nations persist in preparing for it we cannot lie a mere unresisting and helpless booty for the first well-armed aggressor.

How much, then, do we need? If we cannot by agreement with our chief rivals make ourselves secure, we must accomplish the same result by building up to substantial equality. For we cannot forget that the principal nations

*Continued on next page*

Con

FREDERICK J. LIBBY,

Exec. Sec'y National Council for the Prevention of War



HE discussion that has begun on the 16-ship bill now before the Senate has led to many questions, addressed to us both in public meetings and by mail. It will be useful to know the answers to these questions.

The bill is not a "replacement program" in the real sense. Our navy men for two years have proclaimed that "America has only 10 cruisers to Britain's 40." Suddenly we are told "We have 40 cruisers and 22 of them need replacing." A pamphlet published by the Naval Intelligence Section of the Navy Department shows that we have 10 modern cruisers built and 8 building; and in addition to these, 22 old cruisers are listed which the Navy propagandists have been omitting, which are now resurrected in order that they may be "replaced." Their ages are given. One of them is the "Olympia," Dewey's flagship at Manila, 34 years old. Another is the "Rochester," 35 years old. The "Constitution" and the "Bon Homme Richard" have not been listed, but they would make 24 to be "replaced." When Congressman Britten last winter proposed this explanation of why we are asked to build all these cruisers, the late Congressman Butler who was on the House Naval Affairs Committee practically throughout his term of 32 years, replied:

"I didn't know these cruisers were to be replacements. Nothing has been said about them being replacements so far as I know (Baltimore Sun, Feb. 18, 1928).

The same Congressman Butler on January 4, 1927, commented thus on Congressman French's reference to these old relics:

"Tell me where you got that list, please, that list of ships. You have Dewey's fleet at Manila, have you not? You know very well, my friend, that those ships are not worth any more than my old automobile that I traded for 35 gallons of gasoline."

In other words, the "replacement" cry has been raised to conceal the fact that actually we are increasing our navy.

It has been stated that our navy is far behind the British navy and needs these cruisers that it may obtain parity.

On the contrary, our navy, as the President explained in his message to Congress two years ago, is the equal of the British navy now. We are a little behind the British navy in cruisers and ahead in submarines and destroyers. So we are substantially equal on the whole. The President's words were: "Only one navy in the world approaches ours and none surpasses it."

Since these words were uttered Great Britain has laid the keels of three cruisers and we have laid the keels of seven.

What then is the present cruiser situation? The United States has 10 modern cruisers and is building eight more. Great Britain has 13 and is building six more for its own use and two for Australia. In addition, Great Britain has 33 little old cruisers, started during the war and 25 of them completed during the war, which will be obsolete soon. Their average size is 4,100 tons; their total tonnage is

*Continued on next page*

## Pro

HON. FRANK H. GILLETT—Continued.

fancy that they have a grievance against us, they will all be our debtors for generations, and our wealth makes us an attractive prey. Moreover, with some of them, notably with Great Britain, we are sure to have keen trade rivalries. Large foreign trade is essential to her industrial life; it has also become a large factor in our prosperity, so that competition and friction is sure to develop and increase. Some of her prominent men seem willing to inflame it. The dean of St. Paul's recently said that in a certain contingency—

"it is more than possible that the nations of Europe, enraged by the bloated prosperity and airs of superiority of 'the man who won the war,' would combine to draw Shylock's teeth."

When a high dignitary of the English Church and a professional follower of the Prince of Peace parades such provocative and belligerent sentiments, we can hardly rely upon the pacific and friendly attitude of all the rest of the English people.

But, it is said, why increase our navy just as all the nations have agreed to renounce war? Are these peace pacts meaningless? Do they not enhance the prospects of peace and lessen the prospects of war? Ought they not to mean an increase of friendships instead of warships? Should they not be followed immediately by a large reduction instead of increase of armaments? With the spirit of these complaints and criticisms I am in hearty and complete accord. I think they are very natural and logical. To be sure, we have not yet ratified the Kellogg pact, but I am confident that we will.

I consider these treaties a great achievement, a substantial step toward universal peace. They vastly reduce the chance that any dissatisfied or ambitious nation will dare to affront public opinion by resort to war. And it does seem inconsistent with one and the same breath to vote a renunciation of war and an increase of warships.

They ought to facilitate and hasten disarmament agreements among the nations. That is the method by which we should seek a general and radical and progressive diminution of navies and not by an improvident and quixotic reduction by ourselves alone. With our wealth we ought to be most zealous in urging and adopting such agreements. We ought to be willing, as we were in 1921, to make the largest sacrifices.

But we ought to be met part way, and the mutual sacrifices ought to be discussed frankly and aboveboard. And until such disarmament can be consummated by compact with other nations we must continue to make the insurance of our national security by the navy commensurate with the risk, and I do not feel that we are exceeding that by the pending naval program. I hope agreements may soon be made under which it can be greatly retrenched.—*Extracts, see 3, page 32.*

## Con

FREDERICK J. LIBBY—Continued.

137,000 tons. Add to them nine others, some of which are a little older still and totaling 48,000 tons and you have before you the nub of this whole controversy. Great Britain has 42 little old cruisers totaling 185,000 tons, most of which will be obsolete within five years. Our cruisers, totaling 179,000 tons, are already obsolete. Our "big navy" group tried at Geneva and is trying now to get us to give them as many tons of big new cruisers as the British have in little old ones, thus gaining superiority when the British cruisers wear out, unless the British build in competition with us. They don't say anything about the fact that we built a great fleet of destroyers during the war while Britain was building cruisers and that we now have 100 destroyers more than England; nor do they refer to the fact that we have 124 submarines built and building, of various sizes, but totaling 93,000 tons, to Great Britain's 74 submarines built and building, totaling 67,000 tons.

Is our deficiency in cruisers dangerous? No, and for three good reasons: First, we must never get into war with the British Empire, for it would be the end of our civilization. Second, we must never get into war with the British Empire, for it would be the end of our civilization. Third, we must never get into war with the British Empire, for it would be the end of our civilization!

But aren't the "pacifists" trying to "scrap" the navy? No, we are exceedingly reasonable in our consideration for the militarists. We are not going to protest a naval appropriation bill which the President has recommended of \$350,000,000. This bill includes appropriations for eight cruisers which we are building at the present time. But when the insatiable shipbuilders ask for 15 more, we are drawing the line there. The Kellogg Pact makes a starting point for limiting the increase in military establishments throughout the world.

Do we need these cruisers for bargaining purposes?

It is true that the Washington Naval Conference succeeded when we had superiority to bargain with it; and that the Geneva Conference, under the direction of admirals, was bound to fail. We believe also that public opinion in Great Britain has undergone a marked change as the result of that failure and that the next Conference is practically sure to succeed because the people of both countries want agreement and no competition. Therefore, we deny that a big stick is needed. Our wealth is big stick enough.

But will not the navy bill pass anyway? No, it has to overcome serious opposition in the Senate. Moreover, this is action. If there is strong opposition from the country to building these cruisers in competition with England and at the very moment when we are renouncing war together, we believe that the navy bill will fail of passage.



## Does Naval Preparedness Prevent War?

Pro

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

*U. S. Representative, Massachusetts, Republican*

**I**T is because I desire peace so much for our country and for all the world that I want an adequate Navy as a part of our national defense and in order to help make world peace.

I believe much of the hysteria against the naval preparedness program is due to a lack of understanding of what an adequate Navy really is. Perhaps the time will come when the world will be so well behaved that we shall need no policemen, but we shall have them to keep law and order until that time. If a policeman at the present time is too old or is disabled, he is replaced by an able-bodied man. This naval police program in large measure is one of replacements.

Have faith in the United States of America. I believe that our Americans will not want to fight other nations just because we have a few ships. I can not understand why some of the people in this country have so little trust in their own countrymen. We have never fought for any cause but a just one. We do not think in terms of war, but always in terms of peace.

Not much has been said about the policing of the Panama Canal and of the importance of an adequate naval force for the protection of the Panama Canal.

It is agreed by the best naval opinion in the country that if and when we ever become engaged in the emergency of war the great naval engagement of such a conflict will almost inevitably occur in the neighborhood of the Panama Canal.

The vital importance of protecting the Panama Canal at all times should be apparent to everyone. Aside from the strategical necessity during war of keeping the canal open in order to concentrate our fleet in the war area and to furnish necessary supplies to the fleet via the canal, the tremendous commerce that now passes through the canal to the benefit of the world is steadily increasing, and should not be stopped or hindered through any cause. During the year 1915, 1,075 ships passed through the canal, with a total cargo of 4,888,454 tons, while during the year 1927, 5,475 ships passed through the Canal, with a total cargo of 27,748,215 tons of which 15,242,156 tons of cargo were carried by 2,685 ships under the American flag. From 1914 to 1927 the net revenue surplus for all operations was \$79,953,875.53.

In order to fulfill our solemn treaty obligation to maintain the integrity of the Panama Canal, adequate naval strength is necessary, and this was one of the impelling motives for recommending the Navy building program.

Assuming a probability that some nation contemplated a violation of the neutrality of the canal, the whole strength of the United States Fleet could be quickly concentrated—so long as the canal is intact—and this concentrated fleet, ready

*Continued on next page*

Con

HON. O. J. KVALE,

*U. S. Representative, Minnesota, Farmer-Labor*

**I**F opposition to the cruiser bill can be designated as hysteria, then there are no words and there are no terms in the English language with which I have any acquaintance that can adequately describe, I will not say the hysteria, I would rather be inclined to say the madness and the insanity that has characterized the propaganda in favor of this large navy bill.

I know that there is sometimes occasion for being excited, and sometimes I became excited during debate. I do not so much object to the terms used in describing those opposed to the bill, but I do protest against the implications that have characterized the remarks of certain Members of Congress that we who can not go along on a large navy program are less patriotic than those who favor it.

I know that we are called pacifists, but that does not worry me at all. I also know from history that the very term "Christian" was a term of opprobrium and shame for 300 years.

I am opposed to war if in any human way it can be averted. Therefore, I oppose the enactment of a bill which I think is provocative of war.

There are several factors that enter into this program. These factors have been spoken of as the admiralty and the shipbuilders of the United States. The United States Steel Corporation is back of this program and Morgan & Co. are back of this program. I am not so sure but that it might be found on investigation that the United States Steel Corporation had something to do with the fiasco at Geneva.

They say that this is a replacement program. Again, it is spoken of as being a preparedness program. I can not, with the best of intentions, understand how any intelligent human being can find it in himself to speak in favor of preparedness as a way to avoid war, after what he has seen of history throughout the ages, and after what he saw in 1914. That is to me a psychological problem. It seems to me that for all time, at least in our lifetime, we should be disillusioned in that respect and know that what Senator Sumner said is true. He said:

"History teaches that the nations possessing the greatest armaments have always been the most belligerent; while the feeble powers have enjoyed, for a larger period of time, the blessing of peace."

Of course Senator Sumner was right, and, of course, this will tend to inveigle us into war. Germany and 1914 is the answer to that specious argument. And when they say we must be prepared, I ask, "What about our attitude toward Canada?"

Let us have the same kind of an agreement with the other nations that we have with Canada. If we can have

*Continued on next page*



## Pro

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS—*Continued.*

to operate in the zone of hostile operations, would insure protection to the canal in direct proportion to the strength of this concentrated fleet.

A nation would find it profitable to violate the neutrality of the canal only when the advantages to be gained would outweigh the disadvantages of adding the strength of the United States to that of their enemy.

During the World War the Germans decided to wage unrestricted submarine warfare, only after they had carefully considered and discounted the effort that the United States would put forth. The fact that their estimate was in error caused them to lose the war.

The strength of the fleet considered now by the Navy Department as necessary to preserve our own neutrality and maintain the neutrality of our possessions is that proposed in the building program submitted.

It is considered that the local defense of the canal would in time of war be able to repel a small naval force but not an army of invasion after it had landed in the vicinity of the canal. However, in any war in the Pacific with a first-class naval power the defense of the canal would best be assured by concentrating our naval forces in a strategic area at a distance from the canal in order to defeat his naval forces and drive back or sink his army transports long before they could reach our shores or the canal. The same strategy would undoubtedly be followed in any war in the Atlantic.  
—*Extracts, see 1, page 32.*

## Pro

MONTGOMERY (ALA.) ADVERTISER

*Continued from page 15*

have neglected to say that we have nobody to blame but ourselves for this. It has been known for several years that we were falling behind in cruiser construction while Great Britain was rushing ahead; but Congress was indifferent to the situation and President Coolidge did nothing to prod it into action. Unless our memory is faulty, this is the first time President Coolidge has shown any real interest in the development of our navy, particularly in the matter of cruisers.

It does not appear that Great Britain or any other power has violated the terms of the Arms Reduction treaty which was drafted in 1921. We destroyed some major battleships in accordance with the terms of that treaty; but we have not strengthened the navy in accordance with the privileges which we reserved under that treaty. And we have not strengthened it for the reason that the government at Washington has not taken sufficient interest in the subject.

We are glad that Mr. Coolidge is at last stirred. Let us hope that he will impart some of his new-found enthusiasm to the building of cruisers which are so obsolete.

## Con

HON. O. J. KVALE—*Continued.*

it with one nation, we can have it with other nations.

I ask, Whom would they expect to go to war with? With England? That is impossible. With France and Germany? They have not much of a navy. With Italy? Of course not. Our settlement with her proves that she is almost bankrupt. With Japan? She has not anywhere near the resources necessary for a war with the United States. One might be pardoned for waxing a little sarcastic and suggesting that some of our people must be expecting us to go to war with Switzerland, with its large navy!

This bill is uncalled for. It is unnecessary. It is a waste of hundreds of millions of the taxpayers' money, that might be used for education, for roads, for farm relief, for flood relief, and a hundred other necessary things. And worse than all, it will be misunderstood and misinterpreted by our sister nations and tend to bring on war, that curse of civilization.

We already have an adequate Navy now for the protection of our interests in foreign lands, for the protection of such interests as warrant legitimate protection. We have an adequate Navy for defense purposes. If it shall be found necessary for national defense, bring in a program for air carriers and airplanes, and if that program is within reason I shall vote for it with enthusiasm, because everyone knows that if there is to be a future war it will be fought in the air and with airplanes, not with battleships and cruisers which are so obsolete.—*Extracts, see 1, page 32.*

## Con

NEW YORK WORLD

*Continued from page 15*

trade votes on the two measures. Supporters of farm-relief legislation will claim priority for their bill and try to thrust the treaty over to an extra session. A clamor against the treaty will be set up by the irreconcilables and isolationists. Its supporters should be awake to all these perils and ready to meet them.

The Kellogg treaty is preparation for peace, and the Naval Bill is preparation for possible war. The United States can best show its sincere desire for the promotion of international amity by giving the treaty priority over other legislation and by holding naval appropriations down to a conservative figure until another effort for limitation can be made by the powers.

—*Extracts, see 15, page 32.*

## The 70th Congress

*Duration of the 70th Congress, March 4, 1927-March 4, 1929*

*First, or "Long" Session, Convened December 5, 1927.*

*Adjourned May 29, 1928*

*Second, or "Short" Session, Began December 3, 1928*

*Adjourns March 4, 1929*

### *In the Senate*

#### **Membership**

**Total—96**

49 Republicans      46 Democrats  
1 Farmer-Labor

#### **Presiding Officer**

President: Charles G. Dawes, R.  
Vice-President of the United States

#### **Floor Leaders**

##### *Majority Leader*

Charles Curtis, Kansas, R.

##### *Minority Leader*

Joseph T. Robinson, Ark., D.

### *In the House*

#### **Membership**

**Total—435**

234 Republicans      193 Democrats  
2 Farmer-Labor  
1 Socialist  
5 Vacancies

#### **Presiding Officer**

Speaker: Nicholas Longworth, R.  
Member of the House from Ohio

#### **Floor Leaders**

##### *Majority Leader*

John Q. Tilson, Conn., R.

##### *Minority Leader*

Finis J. Garrett, Tenn., D

## The January Outlook in Congress

**The Fifteen Cruiser Bill—Renunciation of War Treaty—Appropriation Bills—Reapportionment—  
Farm Relief—Tariff—The Extra Session Problem.**

*By Norborne T. N. Robinson*



ITH the reconvening of Congress on January 3, after the Christmas recess, intensive efforts will be renewed to carry out the legislative program agreed upon by the majority leaders at the opening of the present session.

Shortly after Congress met on December 3 for the second session of the Seventieth Congress, the leaders agreed that in addition to the regular annual supply bills, efforts should be made to pass the Boulder Canyon Dam Bill, the Navy Cruiser Bill and to ratify, in the Senate, the Kellogg Renunciation of War Treaties.

The Boulder Canyon Bill and the Cruiser Bill passed the House at the last session and the treaties, which had been negotiated by the President through the Department of State, were ready to be sent to the Senate for ratification at the opening of Congress.

### *The Prison-Made Goods Bill*

The Boulder Canyon Bill was the unfinished business of the Senate and, after sharp discussion, lasting several days, it was passed by the Senate on December 14, with amendments, and returned to the House. The House passed it on December 18 and it was signed by the President on December 21.

Next in order was the prison-made goods bill (H R 7729), which authorizes States to enact legislation forbidding the sale within their borders of prison-made goods shipped in from other States. This bill passed the House last session and, after short debate, was passed by the Senate on December 20.

With this bill out of the way the long-expected struggle between the supporters of the cruiser bill and the advocates of prompt action on the Kellogg treaties began in earnest. The cruiser bill supporters demanded that that measure be given the right of way on the ground that it was on the Senate calendar next to the prison-made goods bill and was therefore entitled to be considered next.

### *The Cruiser Bill and the Kellogg Treaty*

The advocates of prompt action on the treaties demanded that they be taken up first because of their international importance.

On December 18 the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations formally reported the treaty to the Senate as the result of a committee vote taken the day before. The vote was 14 to 2 with 2 members not voting. Those who voted against reporting the treaty were Senator Reed, Mo., R., and Senator Bayard, Del., D. Those not voting were Sen-

ator Moses, N. H., R., and Senator McLean, Conn., R. The report was made by Senator Borah, Idaho, R., chairman of the committee. At the same time the committee reported without recommendation a resolution by Senator Moses proposing to define the Senate's understanding of the obligations imposed upon the United States by the Kellogg treaty in the event the treaty is ratified.

#### *Both Made Unfinished Business*

Various parliamentary moves and counter-moves resulted in an agreement on the floor of the Senate that the cruiser bill and the treaty should have equal position as the unfinished business of the Senate; the cruiser bill being the unfinished legislative business and the treaty the unfinished executive business.

This is taken to mean that the Senate, by a majority vote, can at any time decide which of the two shall be considered.

For example, Senator Hale, Me., R., who, as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, has charge of the cruiser bill, might make a motion to consider the cruiser bill. Senator King, Utah, D., or Senator Norris, Neb., R., both opponents of the cruiser bill, might offer a substitute motion to go into executive session for the consideration of the treaty. The Senate would then take a vote and decide which to consider.

#### *Determined Minorities*

The lines are not tightly drawn as between the cruiser bill and the treaty. Most of the supporters of the cruiser bill are also favorable to the treaty. On the other hand, some of the strongest advocates of prompt ratification of the treaty are unalterably opposed to the cruiser bill, while a small group of cruiser supporters are unalterably opposed to the treaty. Consequently, efforts will be made by both these minority groups to delay action on the two measures. How long the tactics of obstruction will last cannot be foretold. Senate leaders report that each measure has a majority of the Senate in its favor.

Senator Hale and other proponents of the cruiser bill take the position that both the cruiser bill and the treaty ought to be voted on promptly. Senator Borah has offered no opposition to this thought. The point made by the cruiser bill supporters in asking that that measure be voted on first is that if the treaty resolution is adopted first the opponents of the cruiser bill will be left free to filibuster for the rest of the session.

#### *The Plea for the Treaty*

The point made by those who want the treaty resolution voted on first is that the ratification of an international treaty is of more importance than action on a domestic measure and that, furthermore, the ratification of an agreement to renounce war will inevitably lead to further reduction of armaments and render the construction of additional naval cruisers unnecessary.

Although the out-and-out opponents of the cruiser bill appear at the outset to be numerically stronger than the out-and-out opponents of the treaty, the fact that a two-thirds vote is necessary for the ratification of a treaty puts the two obstructive forces on practically equal terms.

#### *The McNary Farm Relief Bill*

A relentless carrying out of obstructive tactics on either side would probably result in the defeat at this session of both the treaty and the cruiser bill by preventing action on

either. It is to avoid this result that the best efforts of the majority leaders will be made.

In the meantime the farm relief bill of Senator McNary, Oreg., R., has a chance to come to the fore. Republican leaders, with the exception of Senator Borah, are strongly opposed to an extra session of Congress. They feel that Mr. Hoover should have a few months after his inauguration on March 4, next, in which to put into effect in the executive departments whatever policies he has in mind. In reply to the argument that an extra session for farm relief was pledged, they reply that the important thing is farm relief legislation and that if that can be enacted at the regular session the campaign pledge will not only have been fulfilled but fulfilled ahead of the promised time.

#### *Farm Board and Tariff*

The two contemplated phases of farm relief are the creation of a farm marketing board and the changing of the tariff schedule to the farmers' advantage. The McNary bill, an analysis of which by the Secretary of Agriculture is published elsewhere in this issue of the *DIGEST*, is designed to meet all the needs of the farmer except those that must be cared for by tariff revision.

The Secretary of Agriculture has endorsed the McNary bill and the Republican leaders are expected to ask for its passage at this session.

Tariff revision, they declare, can well wait until the next regular session of Congress, since tariff revision could not be put through at an extra session in time to affect the 1929 farm crops.

#### *Trying to Prevent an Extra Session*

Opponents of this plan take the position that the House Committee on Ways and Means, which starts work on a tariff bill on January 7, when hearings will begin, can report a bill by April 15, 1929, and that the bill can be put through both Houses of Congress and be signed by the President by July 1, 1929, which will make its provisions applicable to the 1929 crops.

Any possibility of farm relief legislation hinges on the outcome of the cruiser bill and the treaty in the Senate. The longer the delay in disposing of these two measures the less chance there will be for the enactment of farm relief legislation.

#### *The Situation in the House*

While the Senate will be confronted with these problems during the month of January, the House will continue the prompt passage of appropriation bills, and will possibly take up one or two other measures of national importance.

Most prominent of these are the House reapportionment bill and the river and harbor bill. When Congress adjourned for the holidays definite agreement concerning these two measures had not been reached.

Mr. Hoover's announcement, on December 26, that he would come to Washington on January 8 or 9, is expected to result in a definite decision, after he has conferred with Republican leaders, as to whether an attempt will be made to pass a farm relief bill at this session or whether an extra session will be called for that purpose.



# Congress Passes the Boulder Dam Bill

## Analysis of the Provisions of the Act

By Hon. Elwood Mead,

Commissioner of Reclamation, Department of the Interior

EDITOR'S NOTE:—The Johnson-Swing Boulder Canyon Bill, as finally passed, contains a number of changes from the provisions of the bill as it first passed the House at the last session of Congress. The provisions of the new bill and how they should be carried out are described in the following article by Mr. Mead, who, as Commissioner of Reclamation, will supervise the work for the Secretary of the Interior.

### What the Act Provides



HE act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain (1) a dam at Boulder or Black Canyon sufficient to store not less than 20,000,000 acre-feet; (2) a main canal to supply water to the Imperial and Coachella Valleys in California; (3) the Secretary is authorized to construct, or cause to be constructed at or near the dam a power plant and incidental structures. (Sec. 1.)

#### Secretary of the Interior May Grant Leases

The Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, lease a unit or units of a Government built plant with right to generate electrical energy, or in the alternative, contracts may be made for the use of water for generation of electrical energy, the necessary plant and appurtenant structures to be built by the contractor. Provisions of the Federal Water Power Act, so far as applicable and in harmony with this act, shall govern.

#### Navigation and Flood Control

Water stored in the reservoir shall be used, first, for river regulation, improvement of navigation and flood control; second, for irrigation and domestic uses; and third, for power. Title to dam, reservoir, plant and incidental works shall forever remain in the United States. (Sec. 6.)

A Colorado River dam fund is established, from which all expenditures to be made, and into which all revenues must be covered. Financial features are under jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury. (Sec. 2.)

#### To Cost \$165,000,000

Necessary appropriations from the general Treasury are

not to exceed \$165,000,000 authorized to carry out the work described. (Sec. 3.)

Twenty-five million dollars is allotted to flood control to be repaid from 62½% of the revenues, if any, in excess of the amount necessary to repay charges within the amortization period of 50 years. If this sum is not repaid in full within that period, 62½% of all revenues shall be applied thereafter to the payment of the remainder. (Sec. 2b.)

#### Compact Must Be Approved

The act shall not become effective until Colorado River compact approved. This compact shall control the storage, diversion and use of water. Compact shall be approved by the seven basin States, or if not so approved within six months, approval by six, one of which must be California, sufficient. (Sec. 4a.)

#### Reclamation Laws Prevail

Before any money is appropriated for construction of the dam or power plant, contracts must be made, adequate, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, to return the cost of construction with interest at 4%. No work shall be done on the main canal until contracts are secured sufficient in the opinion of the Secretary, to return all cost of construction, operation and maintenance in accordance with the reclamation law. (Sec. 4b.)

All irrigable public lands subject to entry under reclamation law and preference right of entry given to soldiers, sailors and marines, who also shall be given preference in employment, so far as practicable. (Sec. 9.)

### How the Act will be Administered



HE Boulder Dam bill, as submitted to the President, conforms in all essential features to the recommendations made by the Interior Department in reports made at various times during the past two years. These reports recommended a reservoir of the capacity approved, recommended the site adopted in the bill, recommended provision for a power plant the revenues from which would be used to reimburse the Government for the money spent. They recommended the All-American Canal, to be built and paid for under the provisions of the Reclamation law. They recommended that construction await the approval of the Colorado Com-

pact by six of the seven States, and the provisions in the bill for protecting the rights of the upper States.

#### Original Essential Features Remain

The features incorporated in the measure at the present session of Congress do not modify these essential provisions, but they are helpful. The provisional subsidy of \$25,000,000 helps in the financing of the measure. Provision for payment to Arizona and Nevada, under certain conditions, takes the place of taxes. The increase in the estimate of cost grows out of ultra-conservative provisions for safety, and there is a confident belief that the works can be constructed for less than the amount authorized.

### Primary Purposes of the Act

The primary purpose of the measure is relief and protection to the menaced farms and homes of Imperial Valley, but the benefits from increased water supply for domestic and irrigation uses, and the industrial advantages from power development are such as to make this constructive legislation, the value of which will be realized more and more as the years go on.

### Six States Must Ratify

The act does not become a law until the Colorado Compact has been ratified by either seven or six States. If there is delay in action on the part of Arizona, this ratification cannot take place in less than six months. As soon as ratification takes place there will be pressure to begin construction. Before construction can begin there must be contracts for the power, which assure the return of the money spent on the dam, and on the power house, less the Government's conditional donation of \$25,000,000 for flood control.

### An Immediate Appropriation Needed

It is desirable, therefore, that this Department be given money and authority to prepare plans and estimates during the time that the act is being ratified. An appropriation of \$50,000 to permit of the preliminary study and preparation of plans should be included in the second deficiency bill, if such appropriation can be made under the bill, before ratification. If not, it should be made independent.

### The Silt Problem

The Imperial Valley is today expending about a million dollars annually in handling the silt problem, and about \$150,000 in installing and removing each year a temporary dam at the head of the present Imperial Valley canal. Irrespective of whether the All-American Canal is built, the Imperial Valley interests desire the portion of the All-American Canal from the Colorado River to the interna-

tional boundary to be built as soon as possible, as a means of lessening the expenditure on silt removal and to avert the need of heavy expense of maintaining a temporary dam in the canal. For these surveys there will be needed an appropriation of \$50,000, and studies of this canal should begin at once. It can be made reimbursable as present appropriations under the Reclamation Act for secondary surveys are made reimbursable. The first need, therefore, is for an appropriation of \$100,000 for these surveys and preparation of plans.

### Power Projects to Pay for Themselves

Before the dam can be begun or contracts made for the power house the offers for power must be large enough to repay the money spent by the Government, with 4 per cent interest, less \$25,000,000, in fifty years. If such contracts are secured, then the next step would be to provide for the construction of the dam and this would probably be under a contract. If the Imperial and Coachella Valleys are prepared to repay the entire cost of the All-American Canal, contract for that canal could be let.

### Steps for Carrying Out Development

The steps, therefore, in carrying out this development are:

1. Ratification of the compact.
2. Preparation of plans and estimates for the dam and power house.
3. Contracts for power revenues.
4. Building of the dam by the Government and building of the power house by the Government or private parties.
5. Building of the All-American Canal from the headgate down to the international boundary.
6. Building the remainder of the canal if satisfactory agreement with Mexico cannot be secured, or if the irrigation interests that are to pay for this canal desire it to be constructed and enter into a satisfactory contract which will assure the payment of the costs.—*Extracts, see 6, page 32.*

## The Moses Resolution

EDITOR'S NOTE:—When the Renunciation of War Treaty resolution was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations on December 18, a resolution by Senator George H. Moses, N. H., R., designed to express the Senate's understanding of the treaty, was also reported, but without recommendation by the Committee. The full text of the treaty was published in the December, 1928, issue of *The Digest*. The full text of Senator Moses' resolution follows:



RESOLVED, That the Senate of the United States declares that in advising and consenting to the multilateral treaty it does so with the understanding:

1. That the treaty does not impair or abridge the right of the United States to defend its territory or other vital interests in accordance with the traditional American policies;

2. That the treaty imposes no obligation on the United States to resort to coercive or punitive measures against any offending nation;

3. That the treaty does not obligate the United States to the conditions of any treaty to which the United States is not a party;


4. The Secretary of State is requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the representatives of the other powers.

# The McNary Farm Relief Bill

## Its Provisions Officially Analyzed

By Hon. William M. Jardine,  
Secretary of Agriculture

**EDITOR'S NOTE:**—Early in January a decision is expected to be reached by Mr. Hoover and other Republican leaders as to whether to attempt to pass farm relief legislation at this session of Congress or to call an extra session for that purpose. If farm relief legislation is attempted at this session the bill (S. 4602) introduced on December 5, by Senator Charles L. McNary, Oreg., R., will be the measure considered. The bill is now before the Committee on Agriculture of which Mr. McNary is Chairman. Secretary Jardine, who has endorsed the bill, explains its provisions in the following article:

 THE main objectives of this measure, in my opinion, are: (1) To provide means of handling recurring surpluses in order to stabilize prices of farm products, and thereby to secure, by orderly marketing, the maximum returns for the crop as a whole; (2) to enable the producer to get a greater share of the consumer's dollar by reducing the cost of marketing and by preventing speculation and waste in handling farm products; and (3) to encourage producers to organize effective associations under their control for a better balanced production, more economical distribution, and greater bargaining power in the market. I am firmly convinced that these objectives are essential to a sound program for permanent improvement in agriculture and that they are attainable with the aid of the plan proposed in this bill.

Without attempting to discuss this measure in detail, I shall review its main provisions in order to describe briefly what I believe to be the principal functions of the major parts of the plan.

### *A Federal Farm Board*

A Federal Farm Board is provided for in Section 2, and its general powers are described in Section 3. It is essential, as contemplated in this bill, that the members of the Board should be men of demonstrated ability and sympathetic understanding of the problems and needs of agriculture. I am confident that the plan would succeed—without such a Board it would fail.

The advisory councils, provided for in Section 4, would afford producers of the various commodities continuous and effective representation before the Board and before the public.

### *Stabilization Corporations*

The stabilization corporations (Section 5) are central agencies with two main functions: (1) To act as merchandising agents for the cooperative marketing associations and for individual producers owning stock or membership interest in the corporation; and (2) to handle recurring surpluses of farm products. These corporations would be under the control of producers and would not put the Government directly into business.

### *In Interest of Producers*

Under the first function, each corporation could become a strong central agency for merchandising farm products and should be able not only to stabilize the market and to secure

bargaining power for the producers, but to merchandise the commodity efficiently and to secure returns for the farmer according to the quality of his product. The corporation should become a powerful factor in the market, operating in the interest of the producer.

### *Handling Surpluses*

Under the second function, namely, that of handling surpluses, the corporation would be able to buy surplus farm products produced by non-members as well as by members of the cooperative associations, thus relieving these associations of carrying alone the burden of surplus control. This is a great deal more than a plan to lend money to the cooperative associations. The stabilization corporation, through its ability to handle as much of the product as might be necessary to stabilize the market, should be able to save the producer from preventable loss due to exceptional crop surpluses.

### *Speculation Prevented*

With the operation of stabilization corporations, it is obvious that speculators would not dare undertake, by heavy speculative short selling, to depress prices below a level justifiable by supply and demand. That such speculation occurs is forcefully illustrated in Technical Bulletin 79 of this Department, "Major Transactions in the 1926 December Wheat Future," showing, among other things, that on September 8, 1926, two professional speculators controlled a short interest of more than 22,000,000 bushels, which was 32.6 per cent of the total open market contract in the December futures. Such short selling is sure to depress the price at the very time when farmers market heavily. I am confident that the stabilization corporations would go a long way toward eliminating this abuse.

### *Loans for Handling Surpluses*

Section 6 provides for (1) loans to the stabilization corporations for handling recurring surpluses, including the purchase or construction of necessary physical facilities, and (2) loans to individual cooperative associations for advances to members at the time of delivery to the associations in addition to the credit obtained from existing sources, for construction or purchase of physical facilities, for experimental price insurance, and for extending the membership. Certain conditions are laid down to insure reasonable safety of the funds advanced, and the Board is given ample authority to prescribe such additional safeguards as may be necessary to protect the public funds and to insure their use only for purposes that will promote the objects of this measure.



### *The \$300,000,000 Loan Fund*

Section 8 authorizes the appropriation of \$300,000,000 for a revolving loan fund. It is assumed that Congress will provide for a revolving loan fund. It is assumed that Congress will provide for raising this sum, or as much of it as may be needed, since there is no surplus in the Treasury. This is not a measure to subsidize agriculture by calling upon the Treasury to pay losses incurred in disposing of surplus farm commodities. It is a plan to finance, by loans, a broad program for the aid of agriculture.

With a strong Farm Board to administer these loans, I believe that the principal need not be impaired, and the loans would bear a rate of interest at least sufficient to cover the interest paid by the Treasury on its issues. After these many years of study and discussion, it is, or should be, generally evident that the agricultural problems which this measure is designed to solve are charged with a vital public interest justifying Governmental assistance, including public loans.

### *Individual Cooperative Associations*

It might seem, upon hasty consideration of this measure, that the terms of the loans give preference to the stabilization corporations as compared with individual cooperative associations. With more careful study, however, it becomes evident that these associations are granted advantages, through the corporations, which should be decidedly helpful to the cooperative movement. As already pointed out, these corporations would be well qualified to act as central merchandising agencies for the member organizations, and would stand ready to meet emergencies due to recurring surpluses, without placing the burden of surplus control exclusively upon the cooperative associations.

Liberal but carefully controlled financing of the stabilization corporations is necessary, especially in the formative stages of their development and until it shall have become possible to finance their operations through regularly constituted credit agencies. Moreover, the stabilization corporations would be owned by the cooperative associations and by individual producers who might acquire shares of stock. There is, therefore, no fundamental difference between the assistance granted to the individual cooperative associations and that granted to the stabilization corporations.

### *Assistance to Cooperative Marketing*

Many forms of direct assistance would be granted to cooperative marketing under this bill. Provision is made in Section 9 for clearing-house associations for more advantageous distribution of perishable agricultural commodities. The direct loans to cooperative associations are designed to strengthen the cooperative movement. In fact, one of the principal objectives of the whole measure is to encourage producers to organize for more effective control of their business, and it is evident that a properly constituted board would make every effort to carry out the declared policy.

This measure, if enacted into law, in my opinion, would afford a powerful aid to cooperation in agriculture; could be put into operation quickly after the organization of the board and of advisory councils, and would not require many additional Government employees.

### *Work of the Farm Board*

While this measure goes far beyond any agricultural legislation yet enacted, it is based in a large measure upon existing legislation, especially that providing for agricultural credit and research. I believe that the proposed Farm Board and the whole system of advisory councils, stabilization corporations, and underlying structure of cooperative associations, would enhance greatly the effectiveness of the results of economic and technological research in agriculture.

The actions of the Board, the business policies of the stabilization corporations and of the cooperative associations, and the development of suitable programs of planting and breeding, must be based on adequate information, as suggested in Section 3, Paragraph (g) and (h). It would be necessary, therefore, to strengthen our research especially on factors affecting crop prices, competition and demand in foreign countries, and new uses of farm products.

### *Experiences to Control Amendment of Law*

Should this bill become law, it probably would be necessary to amend it from time to time, as contemplated in Section 3, paragraph (c), which directs the Board to make an annual report to Congress on "any matter relating to the better effectuation of the declared policy, including recommendations for legislation." The necessity of making changes in the light of experience certainly would apply to any surplus-control legislation.

This measure, having been introduced and copies distributed, no doubt is being studied in detail by agricultural leaders and others, and it is highly probable that meritorious suggestions will be made for its improvement. I do not believe, however, that it should be necessary to change its fundamental structure, as it includes those basic provisions on which there appears to be an increasingly general agreement.

No single measure could be expected to include all that should be done by legislation to strengthen the economic position of agriculture. But I am firmly of the opinion that this bill provides the basis for a substantial and permanent improvement of this, our basic industry.

I do not believe that the relation of other needed legislation to this measure is such as to necessitate its delay pending the enactment or prolonged consideration of such legislation. Since it would require some time to put the provisions of this bill into operation, I believe that it should be passed as early as possible in order to make it applicable to the 1929 crop.—*Extracts see 7 pg. 32.*

# Action Taken by Congress

## A Daily Summary of the Proceedings of the House and Senate

### December 3, 1928, to December 20, 1928

*Note*—This department contains a record of action on the floor of the House and the Senate. By following it from month to month the reader obtains a compact but complete review of the work actually done by Congress throughout the session. The principal abbreviations used are the following: H. R. means House bill; H. Res. means House Resolution; H. J. Res. means House Joint Resolution; H. Con. Res. means House Concurrent Resolution; S. means Senate Bill; S. Res., Senate Resolution; S. J. Res., Senate Joint Resolution, and S. Con. Res., Senate Concurrent Resolution. If reference is made to the consideration or action by the Senate of a House bill or resolution, it means that the House has passed it and sent it to the Senate, and vice versa.

#### MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1928

##### SENATE:

Charles G. Dawes, of Illinois, Vice-President of the United States, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock noon, beginning the second or "short" session of the Seventieth Congress.

The opening prayer was delivered by the chaplain of the Senate, the Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips.

Eighty-one Senators were present.

Adopted resolution offered by Mr. Borah, Idaho, R., expressing the regret of the Senate on the death of Senator Frank R. Gooding, of Idaho.

The oath of office was administered to three new Senators, Senator John Thomas, Idaho, Republican; Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, Michigan, Republican, and Senator Otis F. Glenn, of Illinois, Republican.

Agreed to a resolution offered by Mr. Curtis, Kans., R., Republican floor leader, for the appointment of two Senators to notify the President that a quorum of each House of Congress had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communications the President might be pleased to make.

The Vice President appointed as members of the committee Mr. Curtis and Mr. Robinson of Alabama, Democrat.

Adjourned out of respect for the late Senator Gooding.

##### HOUSE:

Nicholas Longworth of Ohio, Speaker of the House of Representatives, called the House to order at 12 o'clock noon.

The opening prayer was delivered by the Rev. James Shera Montgomery.

Three hundred and seventy-four members were present.

The Speaker laid before the House the resignation of W. B. Bowling (D.), as a member of the House from the Fifth Alabama District.

Received a message from the Senate announcing the passage by the Senate of a number of bills and resolutions in the closing hours of the last session which had not been sent to the House.

Administered the oath of office to the following seven new members, elected to fill vacancies: LaFayette L. Patterson, Ala.; Earl W. Vincent, Iowa; John W. McCormack, Mass.; Richard B. Wigglesworth, Mass.; Francis D. Cushman, N. Y.; Robert R. Butler, Oreg., and Joseph Wolfenden, Penna.

Agreed to a resolution offered by Representative John Q. Tilson (Conn., R.), floor leader, for the appointment of three members of the joint committee to notify the President of the assembling of Congress. The chair appointed Rep. Tilson, Hawley (Oreg., R.), and Garrett (Tenn., D.).

Representative Garrett, Democratic floor leader, announced the appointment by the Democratic caucus, of Representative John C. Box (Texas) as Democratic whip to succeed the late Representative William A. Oldfield of Arkansas.

Adopted a resolution expressing the regret of the House at the death of four members of the House, Representatives W. A. Oldfield, (Ark., D.); Henry R. Rathbone, (Ill., R.); Louis A. Frothingham, (Mass., R.); and Thomas L. Rubey, (Mo., D.).

Adopted resolution expressing regret at the death of Senator Frank R. Gooding of Idaho.

Adjourned out of respect to deceased members.

#### TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1928

##### SENATE:

The President's annual message to the Congress was read by the chief clerk of the Senate, John C. Crockett.

Received from the President the multilateral treaty for the renunciation of War.

Mr. Borah, (Idaho, R.), asked and received unanimous consent for the treaty to be read in open session of the Senate, after which

the treaty was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Adjourned out of respect to the memory of four deceased members of the House, Representatives Oldfield, Ark.; Rubey, Mo.; Frothingham, Mass., and Rathbone, Ill.

##### HOUSE:

The President's annual message to the Congress was read to the House by the clerk of the House, William Tyler Page.

Agreed to Senate amendments to H. R. 10869, amending the laws of the District of Columbia relating to fraternal beneficial associations.

Received from the Committee on Appropriations a statement on plans for a new ventilation system for the House chamber for which \$323,000 has been appropriated.

Adjourned.

#### WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1928

##### SENATE:

The President's Budget Message was received and read.

Received and referred to appropriate committees various annual reports from executive departments.

The Vice President laid before the Senate the resignation from the Senate of Mr. Coleman duPont, (Del., R.).

Adopted a motion of Mr. Reed, (Penna., R.), that Mr. Glenn, (Ill., R.), be assigned to membership on the Committee of Interstate Committee and Public Lands and Surveys; that Mr. Thomas, (Idaho, R.), be assigned to membership on the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry and Irrigation and Reclamation.

On motion of Mr. Norris, (Nebraska, R.), an address of Mr. T. J. Walsh, (Montana, D.), on public utilities, was printed in the record.

Mr. Walsh, (Mont., D.), introduced and spoke on a resolution, S. J. Res. 167, and a bill, S. 4706, introduced by himself in regard to the acceptance of private employment by attorneys specially engaged by the United States, and gifts to school teachers by Corporations engaged in interstate commerce.

Mr. Dill, (Wash., D.), introduced a bill, S. 4675, limiting wave lengths to be used by radio stations.

Mr. Wagner, (N. Y., D.), introduced a resolution, S. Res. 272, for a Senatorial investigation of the sinking of the S. S. Vestris on Nov. 12, 1928. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Messrs. Bingham, (Conn., R.), Fletcher, (Fla., D.), and Smith, (S. C., D.), spoke on the effect on Porto Rico of the hurricane of Sept. 15, 1928.

Mr. Bingham introduced a resolution, S. J. Res. 172, for the creation of a permanent Porto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture and appropriating \$10,000,000 for the use of the Commission. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

Mr. Fletcher, (Fla., D.), introduced a bill, S. 4705, appropriating not to exceed \$5,000,000 for flood control and improvement for navigation of the Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okechobee, Florida. The bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. Blease, (S. C., D.), introduced a resolution, S. Res. 276, calling for a report to the Senate from the Secretary of the Treasury by Feb. 1, 1929, on the condition of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau and its subsidiaries in South Carolina. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Began consideration of S. 728, the Boulder Dam bill, as the unfinished business of the Senate.

Senator Johnson, (Calif., R.), asked and received unanimous consent to substitute for S. 728, the House Boulder Dam Bill, H. R. 5773, which passed the House at the last session.

After the substitution was agreed to Mr. Johnson asked and obtained unanimous consent to strike out all but the enacting

clause of H. R. 5773 and substitute the charging portion, after the enacting clause of S. 728.

Mr. Hayden, (Ariz., D.), spoke at length on the Boulder Dam Bill.

Executive Session.

Adjourned.

#### HOUSE:

The President's Budget Message was received and read.

Agreed to a resolution by Representative Britten, (Ill., R.), H. Res. 3553, requesting the Secretary of the Navy to detail a medical officer to the House of Representatives.

Debated and passed H. R. 11616, by Mr. Britten, appropriating \$14,800,000 for repairs to the U. S. S. Pennsylvania and Arizona.

Debated and passed H. R. 13884, providing for various building and maintenance projects of the Navy.

Debated and passed H. R. 14039, covering the distribution and promotion of line officers of the Navy.

Debated and passed H. R. 8537, relating to retired and transferred members of the naval reserve force, the naval reserve and marine corps reserve.

Debated and passed H. R. 7209, providing for the care and treatment of naval patients in other Government hospitals than naval hospitals.

Debated and passed H. R. 13370, providing public quarters for the chief of naval operations.

Adjourned.

#### THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1928

#### SENATE:

Received certificates of election to the Senate of John G. Townsend, Jr., Del., R., and Hamilton F. Kean, N. J., R.

Received annual reports of various executive departments and independent offices and referred them to the appropriate committees.

Mr. Bayard, Del., D., spoke on Muscle Shoals and placed in the record a series of papers on nitrates read before a meeting of chemists.

Messrs. Reed, Pa.; King, Utah; Harrison, Miss.; Johnson, Calif.; Barkley, Ky.; Walsh, Mont., and others discussed resolution on immigration adopted by the American Legion, Department of Illinois, September 21, 1928.

Resumed debate on the Boulder Dam bill as unfinished business. Messrs. Hayden, Ariz.; Johnson, Calif.; Bratton, King, Walsh, Mont., addressed the Senate.

Executive Session.

Adjourned.

#### HOUSE:

The Speaker announced the resignation from membership in the House of Representatives, Theodore E. Burton, Ohio, R., who was elected to the Senate to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Willis.

Began general debate on H. R. 14801, the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation Bill, which carries an appropriation of \$1,116,675,389 for the two departments for the fiscal year 1930.

Representative Sears, Fla., D., spoke on flood relief for Florida. Representative Cramton, Mich., R., spoke on denaturants in industrial alcohol.

Representative Byrns, Tenn., D., spoke on the financial condition of the Government.

Representative LaGuardia, N. Y., R., spoke on alleged violation by executive departments of the intent of Congress and on Prohibition.

Representative Jones, Tex., D., spoke on the manufacture of silk and cotton.

Representative Lozier, Mo., D., spoke on prohibition enforcement.

Representative Bacon, N. Y., R., spoke on the recent accomplishments of the Post Office Department with respect to carrying transoceanic mails and air mails.

Representative Douglas, Ariz., D., spoke on Boulder Dam.

Representative Wood, Ind., R., discussed the provisions of the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation Bill.

Representative Hastings, Okla., D., spoke on the provisions of the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation Bill.

Adjourned.

#### FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1928

#### SENATE:

Resumed consideration of the Boulder Dam bill, the unfinished business of the Senate.

The oath of office was administered to Mr. Larrazola, elected senator from New Mexico to fill the unexpired term of the late Mr. Andrieus Jones.

Mr. Johnson, Calif., R., Mr. King, Utah, D., Mr. Pittman, Nev., D., Mr. Hayden, Ariz., D., and others spoke on the Boulder Dam Bill.

Executive Session.

Recessed.

#### HOUSE:

Adopted H. Res. 252 authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to sit during the sessions and recesses of the present Congress for the preparation of a Tariff Bill.

Resumed consideration of H. R. 14801, the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation Bill.

Mr. LaGuardia, N. Y., R., Mr. Cramton, Mich., R., Mr. Wood, Ind., R., and others spoke on the bill.

Adjourned until Monday, December 9.

#### SATURDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1928

#### SENATE:

Resumed debate on the Boulder Dam Bill, as unfinished business.

Executive Session.

Adjourned.

#### HOUSE:

The House was not in session.

#### MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1928

#### SENATE:

Agreed to S. Con. Res. 24 providing for the appointment of a joint committee of the House and Senate to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect on March 4, 1929.

Passed S. 1462 authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make studies and surveys of the lands to be embraced in the proposed Columbia Basin reclamation project and report to Congress not later than December 10, 1931.

Passed H. R. 279 incorporating the Howard University of the District of Columbia.

Passed H. R. 12533 authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of certain lighthouse reservations and to acquire certain lands for lighthouse purposes.

Passed H. R. 7346 conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to pass judgment upon any claim against the U. S. by the Winnebago Indians.

Passed H. R. 11983 providing for issuance of perpetual easements to the department of fish and game of Idaho to certain lands in the Nez Perce Indian Reservation, Idaho.

Resumed consideration of H. R. 5773, the Boulder Dam bill.

Executive Session.

Recessed.

#### HOUSE:

Accepted the resignation of Representative Heartsill Ragon, Ark., D., as a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs and the Committee on Territories and elected him a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Passed by a vote of 171 to 155, H. R. 10760 authorizing the settlement of the indebtedness of the Hellenic Republic (Greece) to the U. S.

The bill provides that the indebtedness of Greece, amounting to \$18,125,000, shall be funded over a period of sixty-two years.

Adjourned.

#### TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1928

#### SENATE:

Received the credentials of Arthur R. Robinson, reelected a Senator from Indiana and Henry F. Ashurst, reelected a Senator from Arizona.

Received a cablegram from the President of the National Chamber of Deputies of Peru, concerning the good-will voyage of the President-elect of the U. S. and referred it to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Blease, S. C., D., had printed in the record two newspaper clippings on prohibition enforcement.

Resumed consideration of the Boulder Dam bill and adopted several amendments.

Messrs. Hayden, Ariz., D., Johnson, Calif., R., Pittman, Nev., D., and others spoke on the bill.

Executive Session.

Adjourned.

#### HOUSE:

Passed by a vote of 140 to 26, H. J. Res. 340 authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to cooperate with other relief creditor Governments in making it possible to secure a loan for Austria and conclude an agreement for the settlement of the indebtedness of Austria to the U. S.

The bill provides that the indebtedness of Austria, amounting to \$34,630,968.68 shall be funded over a period of 25 years beginning on January 1, 1943, or 40 years beginning January 1, 1949 as Austria elects.



Resumed consideration of H. R. 15089, the Interior Department Appropriation bill.  
Adjourned.

### WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1928

#### SENATE:

Received and referred to the proper committees the annual reports of various departments and offices.

Received the credentials of Phillips Lee Goldsborough, elected a Senator from Maryland; R. B. Howell, reelected a Senator from Nebraska; Claude A. Swanson, reelected a Senator from Virginia; Theodore E. Burton, elected a Senator from Ohio and Simeon D. Fess reelected a Senator from Ohio.

Resumed consideration of H. R. 14801, the Post Office and Treasury Appropriation bill.

Messrs. Warren, Wyo., R., Smoot, Utah, R., King, Utah, D., and others spoke on the bill.

Resumed consideration of H. R. 5773, the Boulder Dam bill.  
Executive Session.  
Adjourned.

#### HOUSE:

Agreed to H. Res. 258, electing Representative Lafayette L. Patterson, Ala., D., a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs, and Representative John W. McCormack, a member of the Committee on Territories and Elections No. 3.

Passed H. R. 13249, authorizing an increase in the limit of cost of alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels.

Passed H. R. 14660 authorizing alterations and repairs to the U. S. S. California.

Passed H. R. 14922 authorizing an increase in the limit of cost of two fleet submarines.

Passed H. R. 13685 regulating the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the Marine Corps.

Passed H. R. 12032 readjusting the pay of commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and Public Health Service.

Passed H. R. 13414 relative to the appointment of chaplains in the Navy.

Passed H. R. 5713 permitting certain warrant officers to count all active service rendered by certain officers of the Navy.

Passed H. R. 5491 amending the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923.

Passed H. R. 5617 limiting the date of filing claims for retainers paid to members of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve.  
Adjourned.

### THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1928

#### SENATE:

Administered the oath of office to Daniel O. Hastings, R., appointed Senator from Delaware to succeed T. Coleman Dupont, resigned.

Rejected by a vote of 54 to 14, S. Con. Res. 26, rescinding H. R. 279, incorporating Howard University of the District of Columbia. Mr. Heflin, Ala., D., spoke on the cotton industry.

Passed with amendments H. R. 14801, the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation bill, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928.

Resumed consideration of H. R. 5773, the Boulder Dam bill.  
Messrs. Johnson, Calif., R., King, Utah, D., Pittman, Nev., D., and others spoke on the bill.

Passed H. J. Res. 340 authorizing the payment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress on December 20, 1928 on account of the Christmas recess.

Executive Session.  
Adjourned.

#### HOUSE:

Passed H. R. 13990 authorizing the President to present the distinguished flying cross to Orville Wright.

Resumed consideration of H. R. 15099, the Interior Department Appropriation bill.

Representatives Cramton, Mich., R., Williamson, S. D., R., H. A. Cooper, Wis., R., and others spoke on the bill.  
Adjourned.

### FRIDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1928

#### SENATE:

Passed H. R. 13990 authorizing the President to present the distinguished flying cross to Orville Wright.

Appointed as conferees on H. R. 14801, the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation bill, Mr. Warren, Wyo., R., Mr. Smoot, Utah, R., Mr. Moses, N. H., R., Mr. Overman, N. C., D., and Mr. Harris, Ga., D.

The Vice-President announced the appointment of Messrs. Moses, N. H., R., Hale, Me., R., and Overman, N. C., D., as the Senate members of the Congressional Joint Committee on arrangements

for the Presidential inauguration, March 4, 1929.

Received the credentials of Wm. H. King, reelected a Senator from Utah.

Passed by a vote of 65 to 11, not voting 19, H. R. 5773, appropriating not more than \$125,000,000 for the construction of works for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin.

Messrs. Hayden, Ariz., D., Pittman, Nev., D., Johnson, Calif., R., and others spoke on the bill.

Began consideration of H. R. 7229 authorizing States to refuse to accept for sale within their borders prison made goods made in other states.

Adjourned.

#### HOUSE:

Representative John C. Allen, Ill., R., presented to the Speaker of the House a gavel fashioned from the wood of a tree which grew in front of the Hoover home in Iowa.

Agreed to S. Con. Res. 24 for the appointment of a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives to make the necessary arrangements for the Presidential inauguration, March 4, 1929.

Representatives Snell, N. Y., R., Dyer, Mo., R., and Pou, N. C., D., were appointed as House members of the Committee.

Passed H. R. 14800, a civil war pension bill. Estimated annual cost of which will be \$415,424.

Representative Theodore E. Burton, Ohio, R., who became a member of the Senate to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Frank B. Willis of Ohio, made a farewell address to the House.

Debated and passed with amendments H. R. 15089, the Interior Department Appropriation bill.

Agreed to H. Con. Res. 45, for the adjournment of the two Houses of Congress from December 22, 1928 to January 3, 1929 for the Christmas holidays.

Adjourned.

### SATURDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1928

#### SENATE:

Administered the oath of office to Theodore E. Burton, elected a member of the Senate for the unexpired term of the late Frank B. Willis.

On motion of Mr. Bingham, Conn., R., the Senate recessed for five minutes to receive in the Senate chamber, Orville Wright.

Agreed to S. 279 directing the Federal Trade Commission to send to the Senate a copy of Executive Secretary Merrill's report and any other report relative to the Cumberland Falls Project.

Resumed consideration of H. R. 7729 divesting prison-made goods of their interstate character in certain cases.

Mr. Bruce, Md., D., spoke on the Multilateral Peace Treaty.

Mr. Gillet, Mass., R., spoke on the construction of cruisers.

Adjourned.

#### HOUSE:

Debated H. R. 15386, the Department of Agriculture Appropriation bill.

Representatives Dickinson, Ia., R., Buchanan, Tex., D., and others spoke on the bill.

Adjourned.

### MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1928

#### SENATE:

Discussed and adopted by a vote of 38 to 35 (not voting 22), the conference report on H. R. 14801, the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation bill.

Resumed consideration of H. R. 7729, divesting prison-made goods of their interstate commerce character in certain cases.

Mr. Edge, N. J., R., spoke on S. J. Res. 117, authorizing a completed survey of the proposed Nicaraguan Canal.

Executive session.

Recessed.

#### HOUSE:

Passed S. 4302, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey the Federal Point lighthouse reservation, N. C., to the city of Wilmington, N. C., as a memorial to commemorate the Battle of Fort Fisher.

Passed H. R. 13144 ceding certain lands in the State of Idaho for fish cultural purposes.

Passed S. 3776, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title.

Passed H. R. 6469, granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the States of New Mexico and Oklahoma with respect to the apportionment of the waters of the Cimarron River.

Passed H. R. 6497, granting the consent of Congress for the apportionment of waters of the Rio Grande, Pecos, and Canadian or Red Rivers between New Mexico and Texas.

Passed H. R. 7024, granting the consent of Congress for the apportionment of waters of the Rio Grande, San Juan and Las Animas rivers between Colorado and New Mexico.

Passed H. R. 7025, granting the consent of Congress to compacts or agreements between Colorado and Kansas for the apportionment of the waters of the Arkansas River.

Passed H. R. 13166, providing an additional Supreme Court Justice for the District of Columbia.

Passed S. 4126, authorizing the National Capital Park and Planning Commission of the District of Columbia to acquire title to certain lands and authorizing the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks to lease lands or buildings in certain instances.

Passed H. R. 13565, amending the Civil Service Retirement act of July 3, 1926.

Passed H. R. 7010, amending the Organic act of Porto Rico.

Passed H. R. 13978, amending the act of March 2, 1895, relating to official bonds.

Passed S. 3844, amending the fraternal beneficial association act of the District of Columbia.

Passed H. R. 14152, authorizing the acquisition of lands for coast defense of the Atlantic seaboard.

Passed H. R. 14150, amending section 279 of the Judicial Code, relating to the method of summoning jurors.

Representative Gilbert, Ky., D., spoke on the recent election and the Democratic party.

Passed H. J. Res. 352, providing for a hurricane relief loan fund of \$6,000,000 for Porto Rico.

Passed H. R. 13665, providing for submission to Congress of preliminary costs for the U. S. Supreme Court building in Washington.

Passed H. R. 12897, providing for the acquisition of land and erection of an additional fireproof office building for the House of Representatives.

Received conference report on H. R. 14081, the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation bill.

Passed S. 3269, providing for the advancement of certain officers of the Army on the retirement list.

Adjourned.

## TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1928

### SENATE:

Messrs. Greene, Vt., R., McMaster, S. D., R., Brookhart, Iowa, R., Fletcher, Fla., D., and Tyson, Tenn., D., were appointed conferees on S. 3881, providing for the paving of Dry Valley Road, Ga.

Passed H. J. Res. 352, providing for a relief fund for Porto Rico.

Resumed consideration of H. R. 7729, the prison-made goods bill. Agreed to S. 4302, the Fort Fisher (N. C.) memorial bill, as amended by the House.

Executive session.

Recessed.

### HOUSE:

Agreed to H. R. 14801, the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation bill as amended by the Senate.

Agreed to S. J. Res. 167, exempting the provision of the Code of Laws of the U. S., forbidding Government employed attorneys from private practice in the case of the Government attorneys in the oil cases.

Agreed by a vote of 166 to 42 (not voting, 140), to H. R. 5773, the Boulder Dam bill as amended by the Senate.

Resumed consideration of H. R. 15386, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Representatives Dickinson, Ia., R., Johnson, Tex., D., and others spoke on the bill.

Adjourned out of respect for the death of Representative Charles L. Faust, Mo., R.

## WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1928

### SENATE:

Received the credentials of Frederic C. Walcott, elected a Senator from Connecticut.

Received the credentials of Royal S. Copeland, reelected a Senator from New York.

Received the credentials of Kenneth McKellar, reelected a Senator from Tennessee.

Received the credentials of Lynn J. Frazier, reelected a Senator from North Dakota.

Received the committee report on S. J. Res. 182, providing for the relief of farmers in the storm and flood stricken areas of southeastern United States.

Resumed consideration of H. R. 7729, the prison-made goods bill. Received the committee report on H. R. 15089, the Department of Interior Appropriation bill.

Passed by a vote of 65 to 11 (not voting, 19), H. R. 7729, divesting prison-made goods of their interstate commerce character in certain cases.

Resumed consideration of H. R. 11526, the Navy cruisers bill.

Executive session.

Adjourned out of respect for the late Representative Charles L. Faust, Mo., R.

### HOUSE:

Representatives James, Mich., R., Wainwright, N. Y., R., and McSwain, S. C., D., were appointed conferees on S. 3881, providing for the paving of Dry Valley Road, Ga.

Accepted the resignation of Representatives Florence P. Kahn, as a member of the Committees on Census, Education, Coinage, Weights and Measures and War Claims; J. Russell Leech, as a member of the Committees on Expenditures, Mines and Mining, Revision of Laws and Territories; Wm. M. Morgan, a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; Don B. Colton, as chairman of the Elections Committee, No. 1; and W. C. Sears, as a member of the Committee on Roads.

Adopted H. Res. 270, electing Carroll L. Beedy, Me., R., chairman of Elections Committee No. 1; Don B. Colton, Utah, R., chairman, Committee on Public Lands; James Wolfenden, Pa., R., member, Committee on Banking and Currency; Francis D. Culkin, N. Y., R., member, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; W. M. Morgan, Ohio, R., member, Committee on Foreign Affairs; Florence P. Kahn, Calif., R., member, Committee on Military Affairs; J. Russell Leech, Pa., R., member, Committee on Naval Affairs; Earl W. Vincent, Iowa, R., member, Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; Richard B. Wigglesworth, Mass., R., member, Committee on Rivers and Harbors; and Robert R. Butler, Oreg., R., member, Committees on Public Lands and Irrigation and Reclamation.

Received Committee report on H. R. 15569, the Appropriation bill for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Departments of Commerce and Labor.

Representative Garner, Tex., D., spoke on the further reduction of taxes.

Passed H. R. 56, authorizing the Postmaster General to issue receipts to senders of ordinary mail and to fix fees chargeable therefor.

Passed H. R. 57, enabling the Postmaster General to authorize the establishment of temporary or emergency star-route service from a date earlier than the date of the order requiring such service.

Passed H. R. 12415, granting freedom of postage in the U. S. Domestic Service to members of the diplomatic corps and consuls of the Pan American Postal Union stationed in the U. S.

Passed H. R. 5864, authorizing the Postmaster General to require steamship companies to carry mail between the U. S. and a foreign port when tendered.

Passed H. R. 10441, providing a penalty for the sending of poisons in any form through the mails.

Passed H. R. 15386, the Department of Agriculture Appropriation bill.

Mr. Letts, Iowa, R., was appointed to fill a vacancy on the Joint Committee to investigate the Northern Pacific Land Grant.

Agreed to H. Res. 271, amending H. Res. 232, extending the time of the Committee to Investigate and Report on the Campaign Expenditures from January 1, 1929, to March 1, 1929.

Resumed consideration of H. R. 15569, the Departments of State, Justice, the Judiciary, Commerce and Labor Appropriation bill. Adjourned.

## THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1928

### SENATE:

Passed S. J. Res. 182, providing for the relief of farmers in the storm and flood stricken areas of the Southeastern U. S.

Received the credentials of David A. Reed, reelected a Senator from Pennsylvania.

Received the report of the Cumberland Falls Project, from the Federal Power Commission and referred it to the Committee on Commerce.

Received reports from various executive departments and referred them to the appropriate committees.

Passed H. R. 15089, the Interior Department Appropriation bill.

Continued on page 32

# EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

## The White House Calendar

December 4 to December 20

### Addresses

*December 10*—Address of President Coolidge before the Pan American Conference on Arbitration and Conciliation, Washington, D. C.

*December 12*—Address of President Coolidge before the International Civil Aeronautics Conference, Washington, D. C.

### Executive Orders

*November 16*—An executive order abolishing St. Vincent, Minn., as a customs port of entry, effective thirty days from date of this order.

*November 19*—An executive order withdrawing certain lands in the Inyo National Forest, California.

*November 20*—An executive order withdrawing certain lands in New Mexico pending a resurvey.

*November 24*—An executive order withdrawing certain lands in the Deer Lodge National Forest, Montana, for resale and disposal of timber.

*December 4*—An executive order withdrawing certain lands in Montana.

*December 5*—An executive order withdrawing certain lands in Louisiana for use in controlling the floods of the Mississippi River and its tributaries.

*December 17*—An executive order creating Oakland, Cal., a customs port of entry with headquarters at San Francisco.

### Proclamations

*December 20*—A proclamation extending the copyright law of the United States to citizens of Finland, effective January 1, 1929.

*December 20*—A proclamation adjusting the right of way for a pipe line through the Government land of Waimanolo, Koolaupoko, Oahu, Hawaii.

### Important Civilian Appointments

*December 6*—Roy O. West, of Illinois, to be Secretary of the Interior.

*December 6*—William F. Whiting, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Commerce.

*December 6*—Col. Harry Burgess, Corps of Engineers, U. S. A., to be Governor of the Panama Canal.

*December 6*—Claude R. Porter, of Iowa, Clyde S. Aitchison, of Oregon (reappointments), and Patrick J. Farrell, of the District of Columbia, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioners.

*December 6*—Claude M. Henry, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

*December 6*—Pat Norris Neff, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Mediation.

*December 6*—Phillip Forman, of New Jersey, to be United States attorney, district of New Jersey, and Edmond Earl Talbot, of Louisiana, to be U. S. attorney, eastern district of Louisiana.

*December 6*—To be U. S. District Judges: Nelson McVicar, of Pennsylvania, western district of Pennsylvania; Edgar S. Vaught, of Oklahoma, western district of Oklahoma; James W. McCarthy, of New Jersey, district of New Jersey; Wayne G. Borah, of Louisiana, eastern district of Louisiana, and George P. Hahn, of Ohio, northern district of Ohio.

*December 6*—Smith Hickenlooper, of Ohio, to be U. S. circuit judge, sixth circuit.

*December 6*—Howard C. Arnold, of Rhode Island, to be U. S. marshal, district of Rhode Island.

*December 8*—Robert J. Grant, of Denver, Col., to be Director of the Mint.

*December 10*—Thomas B. R. Mudd, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of Baltimore, Md.

*December 10*—Samuel H. West, of Ohio, to be U. S. district judge, northern district of Ohio.

*December 10*—Justin W. Harding, of Alaska, to be district judge, division No. 1, district of Alaska.

*December 11*—Brig. Gen. Thomas H. Jackson, Corps of Engineers, U. S. A., and Maj. Ernest Graves, retired, Corps of Engineers, U. S. A., to be members of the Mississippi River Commission.

*December 18*—Julien A. Hurley to be U. S. attorney for the fourth division of the district of Alaska.



# JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT



## The Month in the Supreme Court

November 26 to December 10

*On December 10, the Supreme Court of the United States recessed until January 2. On the date of recess the Court had under advisement 42 cases in which argument had been heard or in which printed briefs had been submitted. Two of these were argued during the 1927 term and three are original cases. The remaining 37 cases were argued or presented by printed brief at the present term.*

**The Case—No. 73.** Unadilla Valley Railway Company, petitioners, vs. Ernest Caldine, Administrator of Harold E. Caldine. On writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of New York.

**The Decision—**The judgment of the lower court awarding damages to the administrator for the death of a conductor on the petitioner railroad was reversed.

**The Opinion—**Mr. Justice Holmes on December 10, delivered the opinion as follows:

Harold E. Caldine, an employe on the petitioner's railroad, was killed in a collision and his administrator brought this action. The case is within the Federal Employers' Liability Act and the only question before us is whether the death resulted in whole or in part from the negligence of any of the employes of the carrier, within the meaning of the Act. Act of April 22, 1908, c. 149, section 1; 35 Stat. 65, Code, Title 45, section 51.

Caldine was conductor of train No. 2 upon a single track that passed through Bridgewater. He had printed orders that his train was to pass train No. 15 in Bridgewater yard, and that train No. 15 was to take a siding there to allow No. 2 to pass.

The order was permanent unless countermanded in writing by the superintendent. Its purpose to prevent a collision was obvious and there was no excuse for not obeying it.

But this time after reaching Bridgewater, instead of waiting there as his orders required him to do, Caldine directed his train to go on. The consequence was that at a short distance beyond the proper stopping place his train ran into train No. 15 rightly coming the other way, and he was killed.

The facts relied upon to show that the collision was due in part to the negligence of other employes are these: The conductor of No. 15 generally, or when he was a little late in arriving at a station about two miles from Bridgewater, would telephone to the station agent at Bridgewater that he was coming. He did so on the day of the collision. The station agent who received the message testified that he told the motorman of No. 2, but the motorman denied it. At all events the deceased, the conductor of No. 2, did not receive the notice.

It is argued that the failure to inform the conductor, and

the act of the motorman in obeying the conductor's order to start, if, as the jury might have found, he knew that train No. 15 was on the way, were negligence to which the injury was due at least in part. It is said that the motorman should have refused to obey the conductor and should have conformed to the rule, and that his act in physically starting the car was even more immediately connected with the collision than the order of the deceased.

The phrase of the statute, "resulting in whole or in part," admits of some latitude of interpretation and is likely to be given somewhat different meanings by different readers. Certainly the relation between the parties is to be taken into account.

It seems to us that Caldine or one who stands in his shoes is not entitled as against the railroad company that employed him to say that the collision was due to anyone but himself. He was in command. He expected to be obeyed and he was obeyed as mechanically as if his pulling the bell had itself started the train.

In our opinion he cannot be heard to say that his subordinate ought not to have done what he ordered. He cannot hold the company liable for a disaster that followed disobedience of a rule intended to prevent it, when the disobedience was brought about and intended to be brought about by his own acts. See *Davis v. Kennedy*, 266 U. S. 147.

Still considering the case as between the petitioner and Caldine, it seems to us even less possible to say that the collision resulted in part from the failure to inform Caldine of the telephone from train No. 15. A failure to stop a man from doing what he knows that he ought not to do, hardly can be called a cause of his act.

Caldine had a plain duty and he knew it. The message would only have given him another motive for obeying the rule that he was bound to obey.

There was some intimation in the argument for the respondent that the rule had been abrogated. The courts below assumed that it was in force and we see no reason for doubting that their assumption was correct.

We have dealt with the difficulties that led the Court of Appeals to a different conclusion and are of opinion that the judgment must be reversed. Judgment reversed.

## Naval Developments Since 1921

*Continued from page 3*

and the estimate of our need made by the General Board and approved by the Secretary of the Navy since that conference. In other words, we were willing to accept the hazard due to a decrease in the number of ships if other

nations were willing to accept a similar hazard. Great Britain insisted upon the fact that her cruiser tonnage was an absolute need which could not be waived or diminished and made an agreement impossible unless we accepted a tonnage higher than we contemplated building. Such an agreement would have fulfilled no useful purpose.

## Action Taken By Congress

*Continued from page 29*

Passed S. 4126, authorizing the acquisition and leasing of certain lands in the District of Columbia, as amended by the House.

Passed H. R. 13665, providing for the submission to Congress of preliminary plans and estimates for the U. S. Supreme Court Building in the District of Columbia.

Passed H. R. 11569, authorizing the appropriation of \$672,000 for construction at the U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.

Executive session.

Adjourned.

HOUSE:

Accepted the resignation of Representative Joe Crail, Calif., R., as a member of the Committee on Elections, No. 2.

Agreed to H. Res. 274, electing Representatives Franklin W. Fort, N. J., R., a member of the Committee on Rules; Joseph W.

Martin, Jr., Mass., R., a member, Committee on Rules, and Harry L. Englebright, Calif., R., a member, Committee on the Census.

Resumed consideration of H. R. 15569, the Departments of State Justice, the Judiciary and the Departments of Commerce and Labor Appropriation bill.

Representative Combs, Mo., D., spoke on the recent election and the Democratic party.

Representative Hoch, Kans., R., spoke on the reapportionment of the House of Representatives.

Representative Lankford, Ga., D., spoke on farm relief.

Passed H. R. 15569, the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, the Departments of Commerce and Labor Appropriation bill.

Representatives Cramton, Mich., R., Murphy, Ohio, R., and Taylor, Colo., D., were appointed conferees on H. R. 15089, the Interior Department Appropriation bill.

Adjourned.

## Sources from which Material in this Number is Taken

*Articles for which no source is given have been specially prepared for this number of*

## THE CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST

1. Congressional Record, March 16, 1928.
2. Congressional Record, March 15, 1928.
3. Congressional Record, December 15, 1928.
4. Japanese Vice Minister of Navy Press Statement, November 13, 1928.
5. Speech in British Parliament, March 15, 1928.
6. Special report on the Commission of Reclamation, on the Boulder Canyon Bill, December, 1928.
7. Letter of the Secretary of Agriculture to Senator McNary, December 19, 1928.
8. Charleston, W. Va., Mail, November 19, 1928.
9. Wheeling, W. Va., Register, November 17, 1928.
10. Washington Post, November 19, 1928.
11. Des Moines Register, November 15, 1928.
12. Congressional Record, May 18, 1928.
13. Congressional Record, February 16, 1928.
14. Montgomery, Ala., Advertiser, November 15, 1928.
15. The New York World, November 19, 1928.
16. Statement before House Committee on Naval Affairs Jan. 10, 1928.
17. Address before the American Legion, Nov. 11, 1928.
18. Annual Message to Congress, Dec. 4, 1928.
19. Speech accepting the Republican nomination for the Presidency, Aug. 10, 1928.

# The Congressional Digest

*The Pro and Con Monthly*

## Back Numbers of Current Importance Still Available

*Numbers starred are exhausted except in bound volumes.*

*The subjects listed represent the pro and con feature of the number.*

### Vol. II

*October, 1922-September, 1923*

Muscle Shoals Development\*  
Operation of U. S. Budget System\*  
Inter-Allied Debt Controversy\*  
Rural Credits Legislation  
Child Labor Amendment  
Review of 67th Congress  
Federal Civil Service  
World Court Proposal  
U. S. Supreme Court  
America and Her Immigrants  
Federal Taxation

### Vol. III

*October, 1923-September, 1924*

Congress and the Railroads  
How a New Congress is Organized  
Problems Before 68th Congress  
Reorganization of U. S. Foreign Service  
The Sterling-Reed Education Bill  
The Woman's "Equal Rights" Amendment  
Immediate Philippine Independence  
The McNary-Haugen Agricultural Bill  
Peace Proposals Before 68th Congress  
Political Parties and Issues of 1924  
Developing Our Inland Waterways

### Vol. IV

*October, 1924-December, 1925*

America's Stand Against Liquor  
The Dawes Plan for German Reparation Payments  
Repeal of Federal Income Tax Publicity Law  
National Defense and the Limiting of Naval Armament  
Postal Pay and Rate Issue  
Review of 68th Congress  
Federal Department of Aeronautics

Congress and Cooperative Marketing  
Congress and the Coal Problem  
Federal Estate Tax Repeal

### Vol. V

*January-December, 1926*

American Merchant Marine  
The United States and the World Court  
The McFadden Banking Bill  
Should United States Adopt Metric System  
Federal Department of Education\*  
Congress and Prohibition Enforcement  
Changing Sessions of Congress and Inauguration Day  
The Direct Primary System  
Cloture in the U. S. Senate  
Settlement of U. S. and German War Claims

### Vol. VI

*January-December, 1927*

St. Lawrence vs. New York Shipway  
The Boulder Dam Project  
The Problem of Railroad Consolidations  
U. S.-Nicaragua Controversy  
The Problem in China  
Uniform Marriage and Divorce Law.  
Question of Capital Punishment  
The Problems of Copyright Reform  
Issues Involved in Seating a Senator  
The Capital of the United States

### Vol. VII

*January-December, 1928*

The New Congress and the Tax Question  
Congress and Mississippi Flood Control  
Can War Be Outlawed?  
Third Term Controversy  
Immigration Problem—1928  
Merchant Marine Act—1928  
The Presidential Election—1928  
The Problem of Radio Reallocation  
Uncle Sam and the Movies  
What is the Effect of a "Pocket" Veto?

*Address your subscriptions to*

## The Congressional Digest

Munsey Building

Washington, D. C.

*Published monthly, except for July and August*

\$5.00 a Year  
Bound, \$7.50

50 Cents a Copy  
Back Numbers 75c



---

---

The Congressional Digest

*now*

In Its Eighth Year

---

Send Orders to

The Congressional Digest

Munsey Building

Washington, D. C.

---

---